949-55
Kis/fou
60494

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-400 023.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 June, 2018

00060494

FOUR YEARS

IN

THE IONIAN ISLANDS.

THEIR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CONDITION.

WITH A

HISTORY OF THE BRITISH PROTECTORATE.

60494
ac

EDITED BY

VISCOUNT KIRKWALL,

LATELY ON THE STAFF OF SIR HENRY WARD, SEVENTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

RX. d. 7

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193, PICCADILLY.

1864.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE Cession of the Ionian Islands by Great Britain to Greece is assuredly one of the most extraordinary events of the day, the due appreciation of which should not be a matter of indifference to intelligent and patriotic Englishmen. A great kingdom has voluntarily retired from a most influential position in the east of Europe, and has ceded to another nation one of the strongest fortresses in the world. Moreover, the national honor is not unconcerned in the present political and social condition of the Ionian people; for these must have been greatly affected by nearly

fifty years of nominal protection, but of real sovereignty on the part of Great Britain. The favourite dogma that colonies must manage their own affairs, has no just application in the present instance, for the Ionian Islands never formed an English colony, nor did their inhabitants ever really manage their own affairs.

The general ignorance prevailing in England regarding the merits of the Ionian question, is certainly no longer so universal as it was in 1851. In that year, Mr. Papanicolas, an Ionian long resident in London, endeavoured to interest some members of Parliament in the complaints of his countrymen. In one of his publications he alluded to the difficulties of his task in the following words: "I have been met on all sides with most extraordinary ignorance. I have been asked where the Ionian Islands were? And what England could have to do with the people of Persia?" But very little is even now accurately known at home either of the political and social condition of the Ionians, or of the merits and faults of the British Protectorate.

In order rightly to appreciate the conduct of the latter, it is necessary to understand the system of government carried on by previous rulers, especially the Venetian system. This information will be found in the Introductory Historical Sketch. To judge impartially of the British policy in the Islands, it is also necessary to enter into considerable details, especially as regards the Treaty of Paris and the Constitution of 1817. I have therefore entered fully into this part of my subject in the History of the British Protectorate.

I am quite aware how very difficult it is for any Englishman to write impartially about the Ionian people. This fact has been repeatedly proved during the last half century in many works. These, as a general rule, have indiscriminately praised the English, and as indiscriminately abused the Ionians. I do not believe that I incur much danger of indulging, on this occasion, in the usual prejudices of my countrymen. On the contrary, the friendship which I have contracted with many accom-

plished Ionian gentlemen of all parties, may have inclined me to be rather partial to the Greeks. To several of them, moreover, I am indebted for much valuable information; though I do not feel at liberty to quote many of their names. Nevertheless, my natural pride as an Englishman is sure to make me sufficiently jealous of the honor of my country; and I may therefore hope to strike a fair balance between the two countries.

In attempting to establish the truth both as regards the English and the Ionians, and also as relates to Protectionists and Unionists, it is possible that the Author incurs the risk of offending both nations, and all parties. If this be so, his consolation must be to look for the approval of those persons, however few and select, who regard the establishment of truth as of the first and paramount importance.

It is of course mortifying to the pride of Englishmen that the Ionians should prefer to be united to poor, weak, and distracted Greece, to remaining under the protection of strong, wealthy, and well-

governed England. It seems strange that the Ionians should willingly exchange the rule of the most popular Sovereign in Europe, for that of a young and inexperienced, however promising, King. It must be confessed that the Ionians have deliberately preferred independence to material prosperity, and have prized nationality above security of life and property. Nevertheless, they have but imitated, however unconsciously, the example recorded with evident approval by the oldest of Greek historians. Speaking of the valiant ancient Persians, who refused to abandon their poor native soil for a richer country, Herodotus says (and they form the concluding words of his immortal history), "They chose rather to live in a barren country and to command, than to cultivate fertile plains, and be the slaves of others."

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

INTRODUCTORY HISTORICAL SKETCH.

PAGE

A Brief Account of the Venetian and other Governments which preceded the Protectorate of Great Britain in the Ionian Islands 1

CHAPTER I.

SIR THOMAS MAITLAND, THE FIRST LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1816 TO 1824.]

The Treaty of Paris, 1815—Sir Thomas Maitland, First Lord High Commissioner—His Rough Character—Convivial Habits—Despotic Conduct—His Plans and Preparations—Proclamation, 1816—Primary Council—Address of his Excellency—The first Legislative Assembly—Sir Thomas Maitland's Opening Speech—Constitution of 1817—Power of the Perpetual Veto—The Judges—Supreme Council—High Police Powers—Merits of Sir Thomas Maitland—His Measures—Wants of the Ionians—Discontents regarding Parga—War of Independence—Execution of the Patriarch of Constantinople—Disturbances at Zante Colonel Napier in Cephalonia—Financial Measures—Death of Sir Thomas Maitland—His Character and Reputation in the Islands—Temple and Statue 75

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL SIR FREDERICK ADAM, SECOND LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1824 TO 1832.]

PAGE

Sir Frederick Adam's Policy—Supplies Corfu with Water—His Conduct to Colonel Napier—Napier in Cephalonia—His Mode of giving Satisfaction—Sir F. Adam's Residents—Difficult Position of the Protectorate—Sir Frederick's Love of Pomp—His Extravagance—His Police—High Police used by Napier—Unjust Judges—Napier's sole Failure—Sir F. Adam Master of the Senate—His Finances—Present and Statue—Supports the Aristocracy—The Ionian Nobles 111

CHAPTER III.

LORD NUGENT, THIRD LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1832 TO 1835.]

The first Liberal Lord High Commissioner—His illegal Reform of the Constitution—The first Parliament which was dissolved by the King—Law Reforms—Financial Measures—Inconsistency—His Economy and Surplus—Change of Ministers in England—Lord Nugent resigns—His Memory cherished 129

CHAPTER IV.

GENERAL SIR HOWARD DOUGLAS, BART., FOURTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1835 TO 1841.]

Sir Howard Douglas appointed by a Conservative Ministry—Acts under Whigs—Imitates Sir Thomas Maitland—Improves the Aqueduct—Expels a Bishop—Philorthodox Society—Its Troubles—Lord John Russell defends Sir Howard—Sir Howard struggles with the Liberals—Patriarch deposed—Difficulties with Lord John Russell—Sir Howard's Policy and Success—Code of Laws passed—Testimonials—Accusations of Proselytism—His Character—Orders English Officials to learn Greek—Neglect of his Orders—How his Conduct will be judged . . 136

CHAPTER V.

MR. MACKENZIE, FIFTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1841 TO 1843.]

Mr. Mackenzie's Difficulties—Appoints a new President of the Senate—Noble Conduct of Count Delladecima—Permanent Judges desirable—Mr. Mackenzie's Economy—Error which led to his Recall . . . 153

CHAPTER VI.

LORD SEATON, SIXTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1843 TO 1849.]

PAGE

Lord Seaton—Revolution in Greece of 1843—District Courts—Santa Maura Canal—Cause of Lord Seaton's Change of Policy—Earl Grey's Cautions—Baron d'Everton's difficult Position in Cephalonia—Inefficient Local Police—Procession Riot—Lord Seaton warned in vain—Treachery of Subordinates—The Surprise of Argostoli—Its Attack by Peasantry—Colonel Trollope—Lord Seaton in Cephalonia—His chief Reforms—His Inconsistency—A Self-contradictory Constitution—Murder of Captain Parker on the Black Mountain—A faithful Dog—Removal of Baron d'Everton—An incompetent Successor—Eighth Parliament—Interruptions of Debates—Unionists encouraged, not satisfied—Ionians love Nationality more than Freedom—Lord Seaton an Unionist—Cause of his Popularity—Unjust Criticisms on him—His Character 160

CHAPTER VII.

SIR HENRY WARD, SEVENTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1849 TO 1855.]

Difficulties of Sir H. Ward—Cautions the Assembly—Ingratitude of latter to Lord Seaton—First Assembly of Sir Henry—Fresh Revolt in Cephalonia—Nodaro, Vlaco, Colonel Trollope—His Measures—Sir H. Ward in Cephalonia—Second Amnesty—Reforms—Ninth Parliament—Disputes about the Oath—Compromise effected—Modified Oath established—Count Caruso—Character of new Assembly—Neglect of Commerce by the Protection—Imprudent Speech of the Lord High Commissioner—Electors and Members of Assembly banished—Deficiency of Revenue—Tenth Parliament twice Prorogued—Sir H. Ward's attempted Reductions—The most Democratic Assembly—The Great Characteristic of Englishmen 186

CHAPTER VIII.

SIR JOHN YOUNG, BART., EIGHTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[FROM MARCH 1855 TO JANUARY 1859.]

State of the Assembly—Want of influence of the Protectorate—State of Municipalities—Petition to colonize Corfu—Resolution for Union with Greece—Bread refused to Turks—Procession of Saint Spiridion—Insult to the Lord High Commissioner—The latter unsupported by the

PAGE

Colonial Minister—Mr. Gladstone's Mission—Famous Despatch Robbery—Arrival of the High Commissioner Extraordinary—Mr. Gladstone's Speech to the Senate—Visits Santa Maura and Cephalonia—Mistakes the Opinions of the Cephalonians—Visits Zante—Mr. Gladstone's unfortunate Diplomacy—Declines to receive certain Petitions—Deceived at Athens—Corfu Journal in the Pay of Otho—Episcopal Contretemps at Paxo—How the desire for Union arose at Paxo—Sir John Young recalled—Praised by Mr. Gladstone 209

CHAPTER IX.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, NINTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[JANUARY, 1859.]

Mr. Gladstone's Message to the Assembly—Declaration in favour of Union—Petition to her Majesty—Its Rejection—Ionian Idea of the Duties of the Protectorate—Conduct of the Protectionists—Count Dusmani, Mr. Gladstone, Gil Blas—The proposed Reforms—Proposed Responsibility of the Lord High Commissioner—Rejection of the Reforms—Mr. Gladstone's good Advice—Desires to raise the Position of the Judges—Defects of Mr. Gladstone's Plan—Proposed Reduction of Members' Salaries—Mr. Gladstone's Departure—Disrespect of the Assembly—Want of Generosity in Mr. Gladstone—Unenviable Legacy left by him—His skilful Retreat from a bad Position 230

CHAPTER X.

MAJOR-GONERAL SIR HENRY KNIGHT STORKS, TENTH AND LAST LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1859 TO 1864.]

Sir H. Storks assumes the Government—Democratic Aspect of the House of Assembly—Sir H. Storks makes Acquaintance with Signor Lascarato—Mysteries of Cephalonia—Lascarato flies to England excommunicated—Severity of his Book—A literary Malay—Warfare with Lombardo—Lascarato in Prison—Slow Justice—Gratitude—A good Protectionist—Count Caruso Enemy of Lascarato—Ball to Sir Henry Storks—Petition that Corfu might be converted into a Colony—Dandolo's Letter to Lord John Russell—Sir Henry's autocratic Self-confidence—Forbearance to the Assembly recommended—Another Holiday decreed—Local Abuses—Attack on Mr. Gladstone in the Assembly—The Lord High Commissioner warns the House—The latter prorogued for six Months—Unnecessary Fears—Anomalous Position of the Protectorate—English Ministers determined to maintain it—Ill-

PAGE

directed Ambition—Advantages of Ignorance—Competition introduced into Offices—Neglect of the Circular of Sir Howard Douglas—The King of Dummies—Case of Sir George Marcoran—The English Judges also attacked—Responsibility of the Lord High Commissioner—Different Manner of Treating the same Offences—The Case of Count Dusmani—Twelfth Parliament imitates its Predecessors—Proposal that his Excellency should address the Assembly in Greek—Opposition of the Chamber—Change in Ionian Sentiments—Protectionists justified—The Protectorate to blame—Increase of British Moral Influence—His Excellency a bad Prophet—Unanimous vote for the Union—Assembly prorogued for Six Months—Conditions of Cession—The Corfu Clubs—The Fortifications—Character of Sir H. Storks—Future of the Greek Race 247

APPENDIX 291

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 21, tenth line from top, *for* "they," *read* "the Corfiots."
„ 26, third line from top, *for* "orderly," *read* "regular."
„ 52, fourth line from top, *for* "Jews," *read* "former."
„ 89, tenth line from bottom of text, erase "them."
„ „ first line of note, *for* "versions," *read* "version."
„ 96, last line but one, *for* "presidents," *read* "Residents."
„ 97, last line but one of note, *for* "eveloppée," *read* "enveloppée."
„ 98, fourth line from bottom of text, *for* "is," *read* "was."
„ 113, seventh line from top, *for* "Buffolo," *read* "Ruffolo."
„ „ first line of note, *for* "Rudolfo," *read* "Landolfo."
„ 120, tenth line from bottom of text, *for* "154,000*l.*," *read* "164,000*l.*"
„ 132, sixth line from bottom of text, after the word "future," erase the remainder of the paragraph, and substitute the following: "to 35,000*l.* the amount to be paid to the Protectorate as a military contribution. At the same time the English portion of the local civil list was fixed at 15,000*l.*"
„ 134, first line of note, *for* "a short visit," *read* "two short visits."
„ 149, fifth line from top, *for* "honour," *read* "honor."

INTRODUCTORY HISTORICAL SKETCH.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE VENETIAN AND OTHER GOVERNMENTS WHICH PRECEDED THE PROTECTORATE OF GREAT BRITAIN IN THE IONIAN ISLANDS.

THE purport of this Introduction is to explain the system of government conducted by the Venetian Republic in the Ionian Islands, a knowledge of which is necessary to those who would rightly comprehend the history of the British Protectorate and the political and social condition of the islanders. But it will also touch on the French, Turkish, and Russian Governments, which preceded the Protectorate of England.

More than seven centuries have elapsed since Corfu first fell into the hands of Venice; but its occupation was only temporary on that occasion. The island and fortress of Corfu had in 1148 been taken by Roger, King of Sicily, from the Greek emperor, Manuel Comnenus. The latter, to recover them, formed an alliance with Venice, which

was crowned with success. But this alliance between Greeks and Venetians did not occasion friendly feelings between the two nations. On the contrary, we are told that even during the siege the greatest discord prevailed. At one time it even broke out into open strife, when the Venetians attacked and destroyed a great part of the emperor's fleet. Finally, however, the citadel surrendered to the Venetians, and was taken possession of by them in the name of the Greek emperor.* The Venetians did not remain long on this occasion.

A.D. 1204.—After the first conquest of Constantinople (that by the Latins), the Venetians obtained a large share of the spoils of the Greek empire. They lost no time in endeavouring to secure Corfu, one of the numerous islands assigned to Venice. Corfu, though nominally a part of the Greek emperor's domains, was really in the hands of Latin princes, who were unable to defend the island. It surrendered without resistance to the Venetian fleet, whilst the Counts of Cephalonia and Zante acknowledged the Doge of Venice as their liege lord. The nominal territories of the Republic were at this time very extensive. But, owing to the want of sufficient land forces, her actual sovereignty over her distant possession de-

* Daru's *Histoire de Vénise*. *Delle Cose Corciresi*, by A. Mustoxidi. The Chevalier Mustoxidi, the archon at Corfu, lately deceased, was employed in writing a history of his country. His premature death interrupted his labours. But the histories by Count Ermanno Lunzi, of Zante, will, when all completed, compensate for the loss sustained by the death of the archon.

pended, in a great measure, on the presence of her fleets, which could not guard and control many places at the same time.

A.D. 1207.—To preserve Corfu, Venice sent a small colony there. Ten Venetians were made feudal nobles of the island, and were appointed to rule it in the interest of Venice. They were also bound to keep a small garrison of soldiers for its defence. To satisfy the Corfiots, it was stipulated that the churches should be maintained exactly as in the time of the Greek emperors, and that the inhabitants should not be burdened with fresh taxes. The scheme, however, of a colony failed, probably owing to insufficient numbers, and Venice vainly tried to conciliate the inhabitants. Religion and nationality strongly opposed her rule, whilst they befriended the designs of the despot of Epirus, a Greek prince into whose hands Corfu soon after fell. From thence it passed to the house of Anjou, and afterwards to its various heirs and successors, who also acquired the islands of Zante and Cephalonia.*

The loss of Corfu was deeply felt by the Venetians. Indeed, for a state which claimed the right of sovereignty throughout the Adriatic, Corfu, which guards or menaces that gulf, was an indispensable possession. Venice spared no efforts to recover the island, and in the course of time the dissensions and weakness of the French and Italian

* Mustoxidi. *Delle Cose Corciresi.*

rulers of Corfu furnished her with the opportunity. As early as 1328 Venice had begun to pay great court to the Greeks, granting to them many commercial privileges, and styling them in her decrees "That great and royal nation."* By force, by intrigues, and, lastly, by offers of money, Venice had long striven to succeed in her object. It happened that some of the discontented inhabitants of Corfu had applied to Francis Carrero, lord of Padua, for assistance against their local tyrant. That prince sent a small force to garrison the island; but, soon after, the Venetian Admiral John Miani appeared in the harbour with a strong fleet. He lost no time in representing to the inhabitants that their only hope of safety and prosperity depended on their obtaining the protection of the great Republic, whose mild government they had already experienced. The admiral's arguments, backed by the sight of his powerful galleys, had great weight with the people. He persuaded them to despatch an embassy to Venice, to request the protection of the Senate. The vicissitudes and the miseries which the Corfiots had endured under the house of Anjou and its successors had long inclined them to desire again that peace and security which they had once enjoyed under the protection of Venice. They were now anxious to take advantage of the favourable opportunity presented to them of realizing their wishes. Perceiv-

* Daru, Mustoxidi.

ing the disposition of the Corfiots, the Paduan leader retired with his troops into the citadel, and was soon afterwards compelled to surrender.

On the 13th of February, 1386, Corfu was once more in the possession of Venice, and the standard of St. Mark floated proudly over the citadel.* The rule that Venice established on this occasion was destined to endure for more than four centuries, and to succumb at last only to that terrible revolution which overturned or shook most of the thrones of the civilized world.

By the treaty with Admiral Miani, the ancient privileges of Corfu were confirmed; and other advantages were superadded in accordance with the ideas of the times. The authority of the barons, of the nobility, and of the Church over the persons of their serfs, or slaves, was duly acknowledged. It is more agreeable to know that some good measures for the administration of justice, and for the happiness of the people, were guaranteed by this treaty, of which more mention will shortly be made.

The first governor or baillie of Corfu appears to have been the Venetian Marino Malipiero.†

On the 20th of May, 1386, the people of Corfu, at a public meeting, appointed five ambassadors to submit to the Venetian Senate, for confirmation, the treaty already made with Admiral Miani. In

* Mustoxidi.

† Daru accuses the Venetian historians of inventing the statement that Corfu had never ceased to belong to Venice. What is certain is, that the history of the Seven Islands, previous to 1386, is for the most part very confused and unsatisfactory.

the embassy was included a Jew, named David Semos. This remarkable fact renders it very improbable (as an Ionian historian candidly observes) that the elected ambassadors were the unbiassed choice of the people.* In my opinion it is a sufficient proof that the selection was in part dictated by the Venetian admiral; so great and so notorious has been at all times the hatred of the Greeks against the Jews.

A.D. 1386.—On the 9th of June, the inhabitants of Corfu assembled at the sound of bells to proclaim the Republic of Venice as Mistress and Defender of the island, granting to her all political, judicial, and every other kind of authority. The appointed embassy sailed to Venice; and appearing before the reigning Doge Anthony Venieri, addressed to him a most submissive speech. "Corfu," said the orator, "at one time subject to the Romans, at another to the Greek emperor, at another time to dukes, and at other periods to kings, hastens to submit herself to you, and to discard all other allegiance. The Lion (alluding to the device of Venice) does not tyrannize over other beasts. He requires, indeed, submission, but leaves to each the freedom and power granted by nature. You, generous Lion, will not forget your habits. Therefore we hope that you will be pleased with our humble submission, and not destroy our liberties, enjoyed for so many years, and unimpaired by age. . . . .

* Della Republica Settinsulare del Conte Ermanno Lunzi.

Let no one reproach us with too easily revolting against the kings of Naples, our lawful lords, if lawful lords they can be called, who trampled on us with cruel violence. If we had waited in suspense, we should have been in danger of a sea of troubles. To fly from the hell that lies in that abyss, we hasten now to rise. And we rise indeed, since to humble ourselves before you is surely a glorious rise."*

This flattering address was graciously received. The treaty was ratified on the 9th of January, 1387, by the affixing of the *golden seal*, and by it the relations of Corfu with Venice were fully regulated. Some of the stipulations are worthy of mention. Venice was to occupy the island and citadel, and never to give them up to any other master. There was to be an amnesty for the past, and remission of all debts due to the former lords of the country. Also, security was promised for all kinds of property, *including that in peasants.* There was to be a public notary, to officiate in the Greek language, for the use of the people. The feudal rights of the nobility and of the Church were guaranteed. The barons and other feudal retainers were bound to aid the State when called on. The boats and markets were not to be interfered with. Fishermen, fruiterers, and other traders were not to be compelled to sell to the nobles and authorities

* Count Lunzi. I have given but a short extract from the long and somewhat bombastical speech recorded by the Ionian historian.

except at the proper price, as to every one else. Finally, justice was to be impartially distributed amongst the inhabitants. Had the Venetians strictly carried out the treaty, the Islands would have been as well governed as could be expected in the fourteenth century.

The Venetians, though now masters of Corfu, did not consider their title to its possession either legitimate or even very secure. They therefore, in 1402, purchased the island by treaty from Ladislaus, King of Naples, who desired the assistance of Venice in the prosecution of his designs on Hungary. The sale was effected during the reign of the Doge Michael Steno, whose slanderous wit, fifty years earlier, had been the first cause of that famous conspiracy which was terminated by the execution of the aged Doge Marino Faliero. Thirty thousand ducats was the sum paid by the Venetians to enjoy legally what they possessed already by the united means of force, intrigue, and persuasion.* In the treaty with King Ladislaus, the Venetians swore that they would respect the ancient rights and privileges of the inhabitants.

The Venetians had obtained possession of Candia in 1204. In the latter part of the same century they bought the city of Zara, together with Dalmatia and the adjacent isles. Cephalonia, Ithaca, and Zante had been ceded to them by the princes of Tarentum in 1350. But Venice subsequently

* Mustoxidi.

ceded these two islands to the family of Tochis, which preserved them for a century; after which, they were conquered by the Turks. In 1482 the Venetians recaptured Zante. They re-took Cephalonia in 1499. Leucadia (Santa Maura) fell to Venice in 1684. Cerigo was taken only in 1717. When the Republic of Venice fell in 1797, whilst Corfu and Paxo had been in her possession four centuries, and Cephalonia, Ithaca, and Zante about three centuries, and Leucadia one century, Cerigo had only been eighty years subjected to Venice. Corfu, having appertained for the longest period to the Republic, had become by far the most Venetian in customs, manners, and policy, and even in blood.* But in this last respect English writers have dealt in great exaggerations. For in the island of Corfu the great majority of the inhabitants are even at this day Greeks, both in origin and in language. Corfu is, however, undoubtedly less purely Greek than Cephalonia and Ithaca, which are the most national of the Seven Islands.

With regard to the nature of the Venetian Government in the Ionian Islands, writers of various nations have been nearly unanimous in condemning its corrupt and selfish policy.† It became especially depraved and cruel during the last eighty years of its rule, when it had ceased to dread the Ottoman

* It is only in the *town* of Corfu that the Greeks are even at present in a minority, as regards genuine Hellenic blood. *There* they form only a third of the inhabitants, according to general belief.

† Gibbon, Daru, Vandoncourt, and many English authors of a later period.

power, or to require naval and military aid from the Islands. Even from the works of those able and accomplished Ionians, the late Chevalier Mustoxidi of Corfu, and the Count Ermanno Lunzi of Zante, abundance of facts may be collected in confirmation of the general judgment of mankind. Yet Ionian writers, especially when of noble families, frequently betray a great anxiety to judge very leniently of the system and motives of the Venetian rulers. A tacit compact appears, in fact, to have existed between the latter and the Ionian nobles. The abject submission of these to Venice (including the sacrifice of their nationality and even of their language) was repaid by full permission to trample on all the rights of the middle and lower orders. So long, indeed, as the people were kept quiet and obedient, and that by taxes and commercial monopoly the Venetian treasury could be filled, the Government appears to have been indifferent to the prosperity of the Islands. Thus the nobles were allured to support the Government of Venice, at the expense of the rest of the nation.*

For the principal part of the details of the Venetian government which follow, I am indebted to the works of Count Lunzi, written in Italian, and translated also into modern Greek. And what-

* Daru. J'ai assez fait voir que dans cette république, il n'y avait de pouvoir que pour quelques-uns, de liberté pour personne, et je sais que si on a admiré la stabilité de son gouvernement on a dit aussi que cette longue durée n'était que la pérpetuité des abus.

ever may be that author's inclination, as an Ionian noble, to deal gently with Venice, I believe that the reader may rely on the truth of the facts which he has collected, and which are worthy of being read in detail, instead of in the summary which I have been compelled to give of them.

When, in 1386, Corfu submitted to the State of Venice, the first governor of the island was called the baillie, a title adopted under the Anjou princes, and to which the Corfiots had become accustomed. This officer was elected by the Great Council of Venice. In 1420, at the request of the Greeks, three other Venetian noblemen were added to the Government. Two of these were called councillors of the baillie, and sat in judgment with him on political and judicial questions. The third was called the proveditor and captain.

Venice also kept at Corfu a fleet of ships and galleys to defend her maritime possessions. A noble Venetian, with the title of Proveditor-General of the Sea, commanded the fleet. This officer, at a later period (after the extension of the Venetian possessions in the East), received the higher title of the Proveditor-General of the Levant. He had the general supervision of all Venetian territories beyond sea, and the charge of their defence. Their garrisons also, composed of Greek and Italian soldiers, were under his orders. The proveditor-general became the governor of Corfu and its dependencies. He was usually appointed for three years. The

baillie was reduced to act as the regent or mayor of Corfu, and became a subordinate authority. To the proveditor-general appeals might be made against the proveditors and judges of the other islands.

Both in 1422, and again in 1440, fines were decreed by the Doge against all who attempted to violate the privileges of the Corfiots. Other decrees were made from time to time to restrain the despotism of rulers, and to punish the malversation of officials, and also to urge their attention to the interest and welfare of the Government. The proveditors, after their return to Venice, were obliged to present themselves before the Doge in council, to give an account of their measures. They had further to report on any improvements or changes which they considered necessary, relative to the places which they had governed. Punishment and disgrace attended the neglect or inefficient performance of these duties.

Strict rules of conduct were given to the proveditor. These were written in a book, and handed by the Doge himself to the official on his taking leave, before proceeding to occupy his appointed post. But in addition to monitory injunctions and strict directions, other measures were adopted to check misconduct. Particular functionaries, in accordance with the system in Venice, were appointed in the Islands to watch over the conduct of the proveditors, and that of the people under their

authority. These mysterious officials were called syndics, and had great power. In extreme cases they could secretly inflict the punishment of death, giving account to God alone.* The office of these inquisitors had fallen into disuse for thirty-five years, when, in 1746, by a vote of the Senate, it was again called into existence. The proveditor-generals were usually persons of weight and authority, but it was otherwise with the subordinate proveditors of the other islands. These were generally chosen from the class of poor Venetian nobility styled *Barnabotti*, and were appointed for two years, with very insufficient salaries. It cannot, therefore, be a matter of surprise that, in spite of laws and decrees, bribery and corruption became the general rule in the Ionian Islands, where the aristocracy alone were allowed any power or influence. For the same reason justice became venal, and a general immorality and corruption pervaded all classes.†

The Venetian Government endeavoured to put a stop to the universal practice of making presents to the proveditors, whether on arrival or on other occasions. In 1569 they decreed large fines against all officials who received presents.‡ But it is one thing to issue laws and another to carry them strictly into execution. Venice appears to have

* Lunzi, Daru. † Vandoncourt, Daru.

‡ Lunzi. In 1777, and again in 1778, the Cephalonian proveditors were detected in taking bribes. The example was followed in Ithaca, Zante, and Parga. If tradition be worthy of credit, bribery and corruption, far from being an exceptional affair, was the notorious custom with the proveditors.

generally done only the first, resting satisfied with her good intentions. To the poor Jews, the making of presents was not even optional. At the reception of a newly-arrived proveditor, they were compelled to spread carpets on the road by which he entered the town, in order to contribute to the spectacle and to the magnificence of the show. The proveditor was received on these occasions by the archbishop and clergy in state robes, and by the officials and nobility. The procession paraded through the streets to the metropolitan church, and thence conducted the proveditor to his appointed residence.

At the commencement of their rule the Venetians had left to the Corfiots their local government. It consisted of an assembly in which the most distinguished of the citizens as well as of the nobles were accustomed to meet and to consult on public affairs. The assembly originally was of a democratic character, and admitted even strangers to its discussions. But such a state of affairs was not in accordance with the Venetian system. Gradually, therefore, but surely, the democratic element was eliminated from the assembly. The artisans and their children were first excluded, and the entrance of strangers greatly restricted. Afterwards a stronger measure was adopted, and certain qualifications were required for admission. Thus the assembly assumed a limited and oligarchical character. Those who composed it were now called

nobles, and formed a distinct and privileged order in the State. Finally, the inhabitants were divided into three classes. In the first class were the nobles; in the second, the citizens; in the third, the workmen and the rest of the people. But all power and privileges were absorbed by the nobles. The hatred so long cherished by the Ionian peasantry against the privileged signori, and the mingled terror and contempt with which these last have so long regarded the peasantry, are consequently no matter for surprise.

The first class of the inhabitants was eventually divided into Greek and Latin nobles. The latter were descended from men who had come to Corfu either at the time of the Anjous, or during the first centuries of the Venetian rule. Some of the Greeks were fugitives from the continent of Greece, driven out of their country by the tyranny of the Turks, then rapidly extending their sway. The Venetian Senate reserved to itself the right of adding new members to the General Assembly. But afterwards, in accordance with the petitions of the Corfiots (that is, doubtless, of the nobles), this right of the Senate was limited. Proofs of legitimacy were also required before a noble could take his seat in the Assembly.*

Foreigners could not be received unless they had first performed the *corvées* in the villages—that is, executed, or caused to be executed, portions of un-

* Lunzi.

paid public works. They must also have resided ten years in Corfu, or have married a Corfiot woman; afterwards, five years in the island, and a descent from a noble father were sufficient. But in consequence of the prevalent abuses a book was established in 1572, to record the names of all the members of the noble families. This catalogue was signed by the Venetian chiefs. From thence proceeded the so-called *Golden Book* common to each of the Seven Islands, as these gradually came under the sway of Venice.

Experience soon showed that the Great Council, or General Assembly, was too numerous and too disorderly to perform satisfactorily the functions of government. The Venetian Senate, therefore, in 1440, resolved to create a council of sixty or seventy persons. For this purpose, the local Venetian chiefs were directed to cause the most distinguished of the citizens to be elected by secret voting from the General Assembly. This chosen council was elected annually, and entrusted, during its year of office, with the management of public affairs.

A.D. 1489.—Nearly fifty years later the council was augmented to one hundred and fifty members. It received from that time the appellation of the Council of One Hundred and Fifty, and it remained in force till 1786—that is, till within a few years of the fall of the Venetian Republic.*

* Lunzi.

From 1440, then, the General Assembly in Corfu became simply a highly privileged electoral body; whilst the real government of the country had passed out of its hands. Thus, as was the case in Venice itself, the Government, instead of becoming more liberal as time advanced, assumed more and more an oligarchical and exclusive character.*

Once a year, between October and November, the General Assembly met together at the sound of a bell. This bell rang incessantly from the evening of two days before the opening of the Assembly till the morning of the opening. For the Ionian people appear in every age to have had a wonderful capacity for enduring the harshest and most irritating tintinnabulary sounds ever struck out of iron. The members met in a desolate old house lying between the citadel and the town, with a long portico in front. It was protected and honored by a guard of soldiers. The walls inside were decorated with pictures representing the ancient historical deeds of the Corfiots. There might be seen Chersicrates arriving from Corinth to found the colony of Corcyra. One picture represented the beautiful and tender Nausicaa receiving the shipwrecked Ulysses. But the picture which must have most strongly gratified the pride of the Corfiots was the one which represented the victory gained by the Corcyræans over the Corinthians about four hundred and thirty-six years before Christ.†

* Lunzi. † Ibid.

It is believed to have been the first sea-fight recorded in history; and this picture of it was one in which of all the Ionians the Corfiots alone could take pride. The ancient Kephellenians certainly also took a part in the action, but it was on the side of Corinth fighting against the victorious Corcyræans.

The protopapa and the clergy opened the Assembly with religious ceremonies. The secretary then tendered to each member the oath, which prescribed, among other duties, allegiance to the state of Venice. The Assembly next proceeded to the election of the Council of One Hundred and Fifty. The method of this election by ballot was constantly changed by order of the Senate, with the view of counteracting the frequent abuses and crafty intrigues. To suppress these entirely, neither threats, nor penalties, nor watchfulness, nor intricate arrangements of the voting and of the ballot-boxes, ever wholly sufficed; so corrupt was the entire system of government, so little esteemed or practised the principles of honor and of virtue.

The Council of One Hundred and Fifty gave away the employments. Some of these were remunerative, others were only honorary. In their large number and brief duration, they followed the usual Venetian policy. Of such as were paid, the salaries were generally very small. One object was to prevent any one individual from having great power or authority, on the Venetian principle of universal distrust. Another object was to accus-

tom many to office, and to hold out hopes to more by the constant occurrence of vacancies. In this manner the influence of the Government was increased, and the eyes of all the privileged classes turned towards it in an attitude of respectful expectation.

The syndics were four in number, and were required to be at least thirty-five years of age, partly Greeks and partly Latins, till May, 1786. Then the Proveditor-General Andrew Doria decided that one syndic was always to be an Italian, and the others to be elected indiscriminately. These officers were looked upon as the representatives of the public. They had peculiar authority, but could not spend money without the consent of the Council. Moreover, they were obliged, when they left office, to give an account of their administration to the Council. They could not be re-elected till after the lapse of a year. The syndics also regulated the markets and prices. They inspected the weights of the butchers, bakers, fishermen, and fruit-sellers; punishing transgressions with fines, and sometimes with imprisonment.

Three annual judges were appointed by the Council, one a Latin, and the others Greeks. These judges had been at first appointed in the time of the Anjous. Various other officers were appointed to keep order, and to contribute to the good government of the people. But the temporary nature of all the Venetian appointments, and the

scanty pay attached to them, were not calculated to carry out into practice the well-regulated theories of the system. The middle and lower classes were ever at the mercy of the officials and the nobles, and were not likely to be well or justly treated. For a privileged exclusive body is less safely to be trusted with power, in most cases, than a single individual, from the absence in the former case of any practical responsibility to public opinion.

Venice could not have resisted her enemies, nor sustained so many wars, if she had not skilfully made use of the naval capacities of her dependencies, and especially of the islanders. These men, bold, experienced, and accustomed to the sea, rendered to Venice very valuable services, especially in the wars which for two centuries she carried on against the Turks. Their services were often generously rewarded. In 1470 the Corfiots obtained permission from the Venetian Senate to elect the captains of their own war galleys, *triarchs* (that is, chiefs of triremes), as they were then called. The first persons elected were noble Venetians, who were members of council. The office of triarch was held in great honor. But still more esteemed was the post of ambassador to the Venetian State. It was his duty to lay complaints before, or to demand reforms from the Senate and Doge, and also to refer matters regarding public rights to the chief tribunal of justice at Venice. In the case only of

congratulating a new Doge they were permitted to send four ambassadors.

The proveditor-generals, who resided usually at Corfu, were often men of considerable distinction and probity, and of a class superior to the proveditors of the other islands. They were aware, also, that any faults which they committed would probably come to light, and entail upon them punishment and disgrace. Therefore, Count Lunzi declares that they generally conducted themselves well. Tradition, however, in the Islands is far from making these officers a general exception to the condemnation pronounced on the Venetian system. The Proveditor-General Anthony Kouri, and a Venetian named Peter Querini, were disgraced and punished for embezzlement and malversation of office in 1773.* But, generally speaking, the offenders escaped detection.

Count Lunzi compares the conduct of Venice towards the Ionians to that of a parent counselling a son; and adds, that if not always with justice, she yet always acted with gentleness. But, in truth, Venice was rather like a feudal father in the dark ages, who regarded his eldest son as his almost exclusive care, and permitted the younger children to be the mere servants of their elder brother. With this qualification, Venice was undoubtedly kind to the Corfiots—that is, to that select number of

* Daru, Jervis. Querini sold to the Russians the military stores of the citadel.

Corfiots who formed in her system the country which she recognized. "There is no example," writes Count Lunzi, "of the governing body of the Venetian State refusing to listen to the demands of justice, and not striving to cure the evils complained of; and when they could not comply, they at least gave a civil refusal."*

The ambassadors whom the Ionians sent to Venice met with a kind reception. They appeared, at an official audience, before the Doge; and they reported and discussed their affairs with dignity and courage.† It will be seen that, although the Ionian Islands were subject to and formed a part of the State of Venice, they yet enjoyed the privileges of reference, and the right of appeal to the Government of the Republic.

Venice had commenced by eliminating the democratic element from the General Council, composed of many hundreds of persons, which it found established on acquiring the Islands. It then advanced in the path of aristocratic exclusiveness by the creation of the Council of One Hundred and Fifty,‡ reducing the General Council to a mere assembly of noble electors. Finally, it created a third body, called the *Consulta del Conclava.* This select council

* Count Lunzi here, I think, insinuates a charge against later Governments, which I should be glad to believe to be void of foundation, but which I fear is too well founded.

† Lunzi.

‡ The Council of One Hundred and Fifty remained unchanged till 1786, only eleven years before the fall of Venice. It was then reduced to sixty, who were elected by lot from the general assembly of nobles.

consisted of the three annual judges, the four syndics, the two censors, and also of three simple councillors. It was elected by the Council of One Hundred and Fifty, which could not henceforth make any decrees without its sanction. It was, in fact, an executive ministry, and the one hundred and fifty became a kind of parliament, with, however, limited powers. As a further support to the aristocracy, the Council of One Hundred and Fifty had the power to admit new members into the General Assembly —that is, into the electoral body—and could thus influence their votes.

The second class of the inhabitants, whose rights, secured to them by ancient treaties, were wholly ignored by Venice, never willingly acquiesced, as may well be supposed, in the monopoly of power by the nobles. It does not appear, however, that until nearly the close of the rule of Venice they made any great efforts to ameliorate their condition. The boasted right of appeal evidently did not extend either to the citizens or to the peasantry. They had no ambassadors to send to Venice, and it would be absurd to consider their silence—the result, probably, of mingled terror and ignorance —as a proof of their contentment. The peasantry, as long as Venice lasted, were the serfs of the soil. In 1786, amidst the first heavings of the approaching French Revolution, the citizens laid their claims before the Venetian ruler. Again they made the attempt in 1790, with no apparent success. Seven

years later the selfish oligarchical Republic fell to rise no more, overturned as much by its own rottenness as by the overflowing current of the French Revolution.

From an early period the nobles of Corfu had exerted themselves greatly to prevent their numbers being recruited from the class of citizens, and for a long time they succeeded in their endeavours. The war with the Turks assisted, however, to break down in some degree so injurious a system.* In the siege of Corfu by Solyman, in 1537, the country was desolated and impoverished, and many of the noble families extinguished.† On this occasion new families were inscribed in the Golden Book to supply the vacant places. Moreover, the Government being greatly in want of money, the privilege of voting in the Assembly (and thus becoming ennobled) was sold for a thousand sequins. The fixed number of noble families was increased, and it was decided to fill up in future all vacancies.

Allowing for the difference of importance and extent, the other six Ionian Islands, as they came successively under the sway of Venice, were governed on the same system as that pursued at Corfu. But, from the inferior rank and character of the subordinate proveditors and councillors, the venality and corruption must have been still greater than in the capital. To give the details of

* Lunzi.

† Twenty thousand inhabitants of Corfu are said to have been carried, on one occasion, into slavery.

the minor islands would swell this introductory sketch to an unreasonable length.

The citizens of Zante on one occasion demanded authority to elect their own chief, or procurator, to guard their rights and privileges. For this purpose they sent an embassy to Venice, but the Senate referred their petition to Jacomo Cornero, Proveditor-General of Corfu. Two of the nobles and two of the citizen class from Zante proceeded to the Ionian capital. There, by a decision dated the 18th of August, 1699, the reasonable and moderate demands of the middle class were sternly and summarily rejected. Increased dissensions were the natural consequences of such conduct. Some proveditors attempted to pacify them; others (and, it is to be feared, the majority) strove to influence class animosities. One proveditor-general, Daniel Dolfino, reported his opinion to the Senate of Venice, that the islanders generally were restless, violent, and untractable. He added his conviction that the dissensions between the nobles and the middle classes, common to all the Islands, assured the dominion of the serene Republic, and the obedience of her subjects. In Zante, as in Corfu, no member of the second, or citizen class, enjoyed any political rights, nor could he be elected to any government office.*

Cephalonia appears to have been more burdensome to Venice than Corfu or Zante. Amidst a

* Lunzi.

wild and independent population, scattered over a mountainous and rugged country, it was not easy for the Assembly to meet in a quiet and orderly manner. Still more difficult was it to keep order at the meetings. At one time, regardless of the laws, all who chose to do so attended the Assembly. It met at first in the open air, near Fort St. George, the then capital of the island. It was composed generally of about one thousand persons, chiefly peasants. These were ready to swear for each other that they possessed the legal qualifications. In 1613, and again in 1624, the proveditor complained of the confusion of these meetings. Even as late as 1754 the Cephalonians gave the Venetian rulers much trouble. Proveditor Pasqual Cicogna, returning to Venice from the government of Cephalonia, writes in his report as follows:—"Cephalonia, the largest of the islands of Venice in the East, nourishes in its bosom a numerous population, which, *excited by its ancient origin*,* is even now distinguished by never undertaking anything except with exceeding energy and inordinate eagerness. Everything that vanity and the interest of the strongest can suggest in opposition to the weakest prevails amongst that people, who measure their happiness, not by observing the laws, but by the superiority which they succeed in establishing over each other."

* Thus the Venetians recognized the claims of the Cephalonians to true Hellenic descent.

Although resolved to govern the Islands for selfish views, and in an oligarchical manner, the Venetian Government always expressed a great desire to restrain tyranny and to check corruption. For this purpose it made many laws, or decrees, either of its own accord, or at the suggestion of the proveditor-generals.

By a decree of John Baptist Grimani of the 30th of November, 1645, confirmed the following year by the Senate, the syndics were directed in future to give certificates to the proveditors and councillors on leaving the Islands. These certificates related to their observance of the laws, and especially to their non-acceptance of presents or of statues raised to their honor. But when universal corruption prevails, the existence of good laws cannot be held to be a sufficient proof of their being strictly obeyed. Nor is this established even by the fact that transgressors, when discovered and reported, were duly punished; for many cases of corruption and tyranny either escaped detection, or were connived at by those who should have denounced them.

Cephalonia, Zante, and the other islands, like Corfu, were never deprived of their right of sending ambassadors to Venice and to the Proveditor-General of Corfu. They obtained also the privilege of electing the commanders of their war-galleys, who received salutes, and other military honors, from the troops and forts. The crews of the galleys

were formed of the peasants of the different villages, in proportion to the population; and whenever the commanders had served in two campaigns, they were promoted to the rank of captain in the Venetian fleet. Several Corfiots, Cephalonians, and Zantiots enjoyed this honor on different occasions.* It must be confessed, that in thus affording to the Ionian gentry opportunities of distinguishing themselves in the public service, the Venetian Senate displayed sound political wisdom and a just knowledge of human nature. Had this example been followed by the British Protectorate (whose government in most respects was far superior to that of Venice), the union of the Islands with Greece would with difficulty have obtained the consent of the Ionians. Corfu was an important post in the Venetian wars in the East. In 1537 it bade defiance to the Turks. In 1571 it delayed the infidels on their way to Lepanto, and its galleys, manned by valiant Ionians, greatly contributed to the glorious victory of Don John of Austria. In 1716 Corfu again repulsed the Turks, aided and commanded by the gallant Marshal Schulenberg. From this time the Turks ceased to be an object of fear to Venice, which was therefore no longer obliged to conciliate the Ionians. Her policy became thenceforth more corrupt and tyrannical than ever.

But the siege of Santa Maura, and its capture

* Lunzi.

from the Turks by Proveditor-General Morosini in 1684, furnished a striking example of the wise policy by which, in spite of her political errors, Venice (so long as she had reason to fear the Turks) sought to render her rule and supremacy popular with the Ionian gentry. Had she employed this policy for the benefit of the Ionians generally, instead of only for the favoured few, the nobles, her conduct in this respect would have extorted unqualified praise from posterity.

Santa Maura (Leucadia) had become in the hands of the Turks a nest of pirates, to the destruction of the security and of the commerce of the other islands. Morosini determined to make great efforts for its capture. Corfu, Cephalonia, and Zante, all contributed galleys of war on this occasion. Those of Corfu were commanded by Cocchini. The Cephalonians were led by Jacomo Metaxa and Nicolo Pignatorre. The Zantiots were commanded by Agesilaus Sicuro. Troops were enlisted in Cephalonia and Ithaca by Colonel Baptist Metaxa and Colonel Angelo Floriano, gentlemen of Cephalonia. These troops distinguished themselves greatly at the siege of Santa Maura. Colonel Angelo Floriano especially displayed on that occasion a skill and valour, which was subsequently most generously rewarded by the Venetian Senate. He was created a count of the Levant, and a few years later he was granted, as a fief, the islands of *Calamos* and *Castus*, near Ithaca, which

thenceforth were directed to pay to the count and to his heirs the tenths hitherto paid to Government. Colonel Angelo Floriano was created Count Delladecima, or Count of the Tenths, and this title is borne by all his male descendants at the present day. Other Greek chiefs engaged at Santa Maura were liberally rewarded.* By such means the Ionian gentry were attracted to love that Venetian rule, which it was otherwise their interest to support.

The Ionian historian reminds his readers that several centuries ago not only Corfu but most of the other islands were acquainted with and exercised parliamentary rights. Vain were, he says, the attempts of the proveditors, whether at Corfu or at Zante, to nullify these privileges. They could neither effectually prevent the meeting of the council nor the sending of the embassies to Venice. In fact, in 1660 the Proveditor-General Francisco Morosini, desiring to impose upon the General Assembly of Zante some persons who had rendered great services to the Venetian Republic, he was opposed by the Assembly. The affair was referred to Venice, and the Senate, yielding to the reasons of the ambassadors of Zante, annulled the act of their generalissimo. The pride of the Ionian historian, in relating the above facts, would have been comprehensible if the General Assembly of Zante had really represented the island, or if its object

* Lunzi.

had been to put down some abuse. But the sole complaint of the nobles was that the proveditor had sought to infuse personal merit into their exclusive ranks: and in all civilized countries the rewarding and promoting of merit, irrespective of birth, is considered one of the strongest proofs of good government.

The islands of Ithaca, Paxo, and Cerigo were governed in the same manner as the larger islands. It is, therefore, unnecessary to enter into details of their political position under the Government of Venice.

In matters of religion, Venice, though at first inclined to favour conversion, soon became tolerant and even indulgent. In this respect the princes of Anjou had acted far otherwise. These rulers, towards the end of the fourteenth century, had degraded the Greek Church. They had established the supremacy of the Latin faith and the authority of the Pope. A Romish archbishop presided at Corfu, where the head of the Greek Church was not permitted to assume a higher title than that of protopapa. Moreover, the Greeks were compelled to share the use of their churches with the Roman Catholics. But the policy of Venice had long been directed towards the lessening of the Papal power. This naturally inclined her first to tolerate and eventually to sustain and support the Greek Church. The same feeling of jealousy, however, inclined the Republic to oppose the encroachments of the

Patriarch of Constantinople. The latter was regarded by the Greeks as the head of the nation, as well as of the Church. He represented the grand idea of the unity of the Greek race, of its future regeneration, and of its ultimate restoration to the throne of Constantinople.*

During the early period of the Venetian sway, the Greek and Latin Churches in Corfu came into constant collision. In 1521 the liberal Pope, Leo X., put an end to these disorders, and to the tyranny of the Latin over the Greek Church. The right of the latter to baptize, to marry, and even to use the Liturgy, had been fiercely contested by the Roman Catholics. As the Greeks will not officiate at altars which other worshippers have used on the same day, the Roman Catholics performed their services very early in the morning, on purpose to frustrate the celebration of Greek rites. It required repeated bulls and decrees from the Popes to establish toleration. Thenceforth, however, the Greek religion grew in strength, and being that of the great majority, began the conversion of the Roman Catholics. By 1777 only two noble Latin families in Corfu adhered to the Roman religion. The principal means of conversion were the Greek ladies. Intermarrying with the Latins, they frequently converted their husbands, and still oftener their children. The toleration also of the Government increased the natural respect for the popular religion, by which the hopes of a great national re-

* Lunzi.

storation were enthusiastically nourished. In spite of the opposition of the Latin bishops and clergy, complete toleration was eventually established. Finally, in 1578, a Doge's decree solemnly declared the head of the Greek Church in the Islands to be independent of every superior, whether Latin or Greek, and invested with full ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction. But in 1582 the Corfiots in vain strove to restore the Greek archbishopric of which the Anjous had deprived them. The Conservative Venetians objected to the novelty. The head of the Greek Church was, therefore, compelled to content himself with the title of Great Protopapa of Corfu, by the divine mercy and the grace of the Venetian Signori.

The Great Protopapa, though he was denied the title, had all the honours of an archbishop. He wore a mitre and scarlet robes, and was attended by five inferior Church dignitaries. He had four subordinate protopapas in the island. The Protopapa of Paxo was also under his jurisdiction. The Protopapa of Corfu depended directly from the Patriarch of Constantinople, but neither of these dignitaries could take any important step, nor perform any rite in the Islands, without the sanction of the Venetian authorities. The protopapa could not even correspond with the patriarch except through the Venetian baillie, resident at Constantinople. Nevertheless, the power of the protopapa was very great. Custom had established that his

decree could never be appealed against, and appeals were accordingly rejected by the Proveditor-Generals Cornero, Priuli, and Widman, in 1697, 1765, and 1797 respectively. The protopapas were buried with great state and pomp. The proveditor-generals and Latin archbishops did not actually attend the funerals, but they sent their servants with torches, and in full gala liveries.

In the nineteenth century we find in the Ionian Islands, as in other Greek countries, a bitter animosity against the Roman Catholic religion. But during the latter part of the Venetian period such a feeling was very much mitigated, if it did not wholly disappear. There were certain festivals in Corfu at which the Greek and Roman clergy officiated simultaneously in the same churches, and they also took part in each other's religious processions. Under the wise and excellent Angelo Maria, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Corfu, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Greek and Latin religions assumed very friendly relations. His enlightened toleration extended even to the Jews. These sometimes took part in the processions arranged by the archbishop, and presented to him the Bible which they carried on the occasion.

But a very different spirit prevailed in the earlier times of the Venetian rule. In 1621, Andrew Bragadino, on returning to Venice, after having been Baillie of Corfu, reported that the States of

Venice were contaminated by the presence of the Greek preachers. He complained also of the ignorant peasants transferred into priests, who scarcely knew how to read, and who yet obtained certificates from the protopapa of being good Christians, and thus received ordination. This is a complaint which may also with justice be made even in 1863, after fifty years of British protection in the Islands.

In 1638 the New Testament was translated into modern Greek, and published at Geneva. A great number of copies were sent to Constantinople. There, however, the clergy were by no means desirous that the plain precepts of the Gospel should become familiar to the people in the vulgar tongue. The publication was, therefore, denounced and condemned as impious by circular letters from the Patriarch, and the work soon disappeared. It was afterwards republished in London in 1703, by a monk named Serafin, a native of Mitylene.

The administration of justice was principally in the hands of the Venetians, probably from the impossibility in those times of trusting so important a matter to the natives. The first judicial court was composed of the baillie and of his two councillors, assisted by the annual judges, who had only consultative votes. There were second and third courts of justice. There were also magistrates in all the Islands. In Zante and Cephalonia, from

the seventeenth century, three nobles were elected from the Council of One Hundred and Fifty. Their chief duty was to act as peacemakers and reconcilers of family feuds, which led in those two islands to frequent riots and assassinations.

The laws of Venice were generally very severe, but they were not always enforced. The same may likewise be said of the efficiency of their good laws. It is not easy, therefore, to judge of Venice merely by her code of laws. The revenues appear to have been well managed by some of the proveditor-generals. Marco Molino, who returned to Venice in 1590, left a surplus of 50,000 ducats in the treasury of Corfu. He had derived in this respect some assistance to the general Government from the islands of Zante and Cephalonia.

In 1762, the annual revenue of Corfu, which in 1590 had been 14,000 ducats, had risen to 20,000 sequins, each sequin being worth nine shillings and eightpence.

In 1552 the average annual revenue of Zante was estimated at 3776 ducats. In 1582, according to the report of the Proveditor Bernardo Contarini, the revenue amounted, for the two years of his rule, to the total sum of 327,777 ducats—an almost incredible increase in thirty years. It was attributed to the introduction of the grape of Corinth, now called currants by the English, but by the Venetians formerly, and by the Ionians still, *Uva passa*.

Embezzlement of public funds was not a rare crime, although perpetual infamy was the penalty attached to it on discovery. The names of two brothers, and also of other Ionians, are engraved in the Doge's palace at Venice as having defrauded the public revenue at Corfu. A few charitable institutions were established by Venice in the Islands. Individuals also sometimes — a select few — displayed their benevolence in public benefactions. In 1680, the Proveditor-General Cornero established in Zante the dubious benefit of a Foundling Hospital, one already existing at the capital.* In 1445, public granaries had been established in Corfu. This benefit was subsequently extended to the other Islands. A *Monte di Pietà* was first established in the capital in 1630 to put down the prevailing usury, and to lend money at moderate interest to the poor. In 1677, Cornero established the same charitable institutions in Ithaca and Cephalonia. Public roads and public buildings appear, however, to have been much neglected by the Venetian rulers. It was reserved for Great Britain to extend these and many other benefits of a higher civilization to the Islands.

The selfish system of Venice attempted to concentrate all traffic in the capital. The commerce of the world was to pass through Venice; other nations paying for their goods with great additional costs and duties. The Ionians could sell their oil, their

* Lunzi, Daru.

staple production, only at Venice. Such a system, ruinous to the general interests, was also a great encouragement to smugglers; amongst whom the English appear to have taken the lead, and thus to have drawn upon themselves the especial anger of the Venetians. The proveditors of Zante and of other islands complained, in 1596, that the revenue was defrauded by the skill and audacity of English seamen. Similar complaints were made in 1601. It appeared as if the then mistress of the sea was beginning, with prophetic instinct, to dread her future successor. Venice, however, was not destined to lose her supremacy for many years. She long maintained her naval dominions; treating as pirates all vessels navigating the seas within her jurisdiction without her permission. In 1618, one of her naval chiefs had the audacity to hang nine Englishmen, three of whom were men of quality. On another occasion the Venetians hanged another Englishman, belonging to one of the first families of his country.*

Before the fall of Venice, however, the English ships had deprived the Ionian islanders of the advantages which they had enjoyed of being the carriers of other nations. By such means many Greek families, debarred from their accustomed traffic, became greatly impoverished.†

Venice adopted a policy in the Islands which, perhaps, more than any other cause, established her

* Daru. He mentions no names. † Lunzi.

ascendancy, but which certainly has excited the just indignation of all Greek patriots. She endeavoured, in fact, to destroy the Greek language, and to substitute the Italian, or rather the Venetian dialect.* Under her rule, the language of the Government, of the laws, and of good society, became Venetian. The Ionian peasants could not obtain justice without an interpreter. The Greek language, especially in Corfu, became the language solely of the lower orders. The Ionian gentry used it only to their servants and labourers. Thus the Ionian Greek became a sadly corrupted version of the finest of languages. And when in later times, under English rule, the use of the national language was restored, it was from the mouths of the most ignorant and most illiterate peasantry in the world that it had to be recovered. Education thus became difficult, and proficiency in literature almost impossible. The Ionian gentry had so long neglected their own language, or regarded it with contempt, that most of them found it a very difficult task to recover its free and correct use. A few Latin priests had continued to study ancient Greek, but, as a general rule, the language was long abandoned to the uneducated classes of society. The diplomas of doctors and advocates, obtained by the young Corfiots at Venice or Padua with dangerous facility, had the effect of encouraging idleness and aristocratic prejudices. That facility was un-

* *Le Spectateur de l'Orient.*

doubtedly injurious to them, though it arose, most probably, rather from the corruption of the times (which made everything easy to bribery) than from that deliberate scheme of villany attributed to Venice by some writers.* With more certainty it may be owned that Venice rewarded merit, at least amongst the nobles, who were not obliged to confine their ambition to the narrow boundaries of their small native islands. The University of Padua numbered not a few Ionians amongst its professors, and other pursuits were free to the islanders. The youthful Corfiot, Cephalonian, Zantiot, or Ithacan might hope either to sit in some honored chair (at the foot of which he had first received instruction), or to rise to high rank in naval, military, diplomatic, or administrative careers.

As early as 1650, Venice established an academy in Corfu.† In the other islands, one Government master taught Italian to the sons of the nobles. But the general education of the people was entirely and systematically neglected.

Corfu was divided for the distribution of justice into four districts or parishes, containing each from

* Daru, Vandoncourt, Capodistrias. Capodistrias is, I think, the original author of this idea. His memorandum was written in 1815, before the appearance of the works of the two first-named authors. Capodistrias wrote: "Le Sénat de Vénise n'a jamais permis qu'on établit des écoles publiques aux Sept Iles. C'est dans sa capitale, c'est à l'université de Padoue, que les indigènes des Sept Iles devaient aller s'instruire, mais par un privilége machiavelique, ils pouvaient obtenir des diplômes en droit, et dans toutes les facultés, sans être obligés d'avance à faire un cours régulier aux academies."

† I state this on the authority of Count Lunzi, but it is contrary to the tenor of the already quoted memorandum to Lord Castlereagh in 1815 by Count Capodistrias.

three to twenty villages. The total number of villages was eighty-seven. In each parish there were four officials. The inhabitants had the right to elect them, though sometimes, by an abuse of power, they were named directly by the Government. In these elections some might see a disproof of the absence of all liberty amongst the peasants. But the elected officials were, in fact, mere agents of police, appointed to keep order, and to report all disturbances to the authorities. It does not appear that they had any authority to report grievances, or to make representations from their constituents. Small as was the privilege of electing such officials, it was highly prized. In 1622, the Corfiots complained to Venice of the violation of their ancient privileges. The system of Corfu extended to Zante and to the islands generally. The peasants formed an armed force, commanded by the local officials. Eight hundred of this species of militia were in 1584 sent from Zante to the war in Candia. Of these only eighty persons returned home. The effect of this loss was that, the next time the peasantry were called out on service, they refused to be enlisted, and fled to the mountains. The Greek troops, however, as already proved, often rendered great service to Venice.

Of the capriciousness of the laws and penal enactments of Venice, General Vandoncourt records a striking example. He states that, on examining the registers of the prisoners of Palma Nova in the

year 1797, he found two entries presenting a singular contrast. One person was condemned to ten years' imprisonment for killing ten men. The next on the list was a man sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment for speaking ill of the podestat, or mayor.

The celebrated advice of Paul Sarpi to the Venetian Senate has often been quoted at the expense of the Ionians. He recommended "that the Greeks should be treated like ferocious wild beasts, deprived of teeth and claws; humiliated in every manner, and not permitted to practise warlike exercises. Bread and the stick, that is what they require. Let us reserve humanity for a better occasion."* Paul Sarpi must have had in view the constantly rebelling Candians, rather than the comparatively submissive Ionians, when he gave vent to such furious language. Anything like an important and dangerous rebellion seems never to have occurred in the Ionian Islands under Venetian sway; though there were, especially towards its close, occasional disturbances. In 1753 there were partial revolts, occasioned by a tax imposed on the people for the benefit of the nobles.† Similar events from similar causes occurred in 1760 and in 1771. A Count Metaxa put himself at the head of the

* "Du pain et le bâton, voilà ce qu'il leur faut, gardons l'humanité pour une meilleure occasion."—*Daru.*

† To appeal against nobles has been shown to have been useless on the part of the people. The neglect of such complaints appears to have been systematic; for Sarpi writes: "Dans les querelles entre les nobles, il est du règle, de châtier avec sévérité le moins puissant. Entre un noble et un sujet, donner toujours raison au noble."—*Ibid.*

rebels in Cephalonia. He was taken prisoner and executed at Venice, and some of his followers were secretly put to death. In 1773, when the Russians received a check from the Turks, the Venetians gave up to the latter those Greeks who had taken refuge in the Ionian Islands. Count Macri of Cephalonia, and Count Mocenigo of Zante, were arrested on this occasion. But Count Mocenigo was, fortunately for himself, a colonel in the service of Russia. Not only did the Empress insist upon his release, but she exacted that all the Greeks banished on her account should be restored to their country. It appears that many Greeks voluntarily emigrated to the Ottoman territories, chiefly Constantinople, preferring even the rule of Turkey to that of Venice. Some little revolts occurred in Zante about 1775, causing fresh emigrations, this time to St. Petersburg. The weakness and unpopularity of Venice was a few years later still more strongly proved in her continental possessions. In 1785, 80,000 families deserted Dalmatia and passed into the Ottoman territories. Thus the subjects of Venice fled to St. Petersburg and to Constantinople to escape the tyranny of that cruel and selfish aristocracy.*

I have written enough to give the reader a sufficient idea of the effects of the Venetian government in the Ionian Islands. The chief evils may be summed up in a few words. Universal corruption,

* Daru.

and almost universal ignorance prevailed. The interests of the great majority were left at the mercy of the few. Unequal laws were administered by venal and factious judges, in a language unknown to nine-tenths of the inhabitants. The use of the national tongue was discouraged, and merit, unaccompanied by noble birth, or unsupported by bribery, had no career. The middle classes were without political rights, and the peasantry were the helpless serfs of the nobles. The few proveditors who were desirous of effecting good, found their task insuperable, and were content, finally, to abandon all effort to check the course of corruption.*

Her own dark policy brought Venice at last to an isolated and languid condition, foretelling a premature decay. Europe looked on her fall with indifference. In her present degraded state she is making a full expiation for her iniquitous career in the days of her greatness—a career condemned by the unanimous testimony of European historians.†

The Seven Islands, suffering from their long connexion with Venice, were destined to pass under several forms of government before reposing for half a century under the peaceful shelter of Great Britain. These, as contributing all of them to her present condition, are worthy of a brief description and notice.

* Capodistrias.
† Daru, Capodistrias, Vandoncourt, Davy, Lunzi, Bowen, Jervis, &c.

It was by a combination of force, deceit, and intrigue, that General Bonaparte obtained possession of the Ionian Islands, in 1797, for the French Directory. The French troops landed at Corfu on the 17th of June of that year without opposition. Indeed, they were received with acclamations of joy.* As they gradually showed, however, that they came less as allies than as masters, the general feeling of the inhabitants appears to have been repugnant to their rule. The irreligion, the immorality, the despotism of the French, at first caused even the Venetians to be regretted.† This was the less extraordinary, as the last Venetian Proveditor, General Widman, who had been compelled to resign his government to the French, was a man of the highest moral, religious, and benevolent character,‡ though deficient, perhaps, in the energy and resolution required for a revolutionary period.

This feeling, however, against the French did not long remain general, except on the part of the clergy and of some of the nobles. The democratic forms of government, and the principles of liberty and equality, could not but be pleasing to the majority of a community, in which, as in Corfu, the nobles had for centuries monopolized all political power and privileges. The love of country—a sentiment which had long slumbered under the rule of Venice

* Daru.

† Count Capodistrias's memorandum to Lord Castlereagh, 1815.

‡ Storia delle Isole Ionie sotto il Reggimento dei Republicani Francesi del Conte Ermanno Lunzi.

—now awoke with joyful enthusiasm. The national tongue—so long banished from all good society—was now resumed. Causes were pleaded in Greek, which became also the official language of the Government.* The Greek religion was proclaimed the religion of the State. The Roman Catholic religion was tolerated, but lost its supremacy. Trees of liberty were everywhere erected; whilst in Corfu and the other islands the golden books were publicly burnt, with the consent, real or feigned, of the nobles. The Council-General, or Assembly, voluntarily renounced all sovereignty, and itself appointed a popular Government, that the change might be effected with the greater solemnity and security.† On the 12th of May, 1797, the vote of self-destitution was carried by 512 votes against only twenty contrary. The Venetian and Slavonic troops were disarmed, and 4000 French soldiers, under General Baraguay d'Hilliers, took possession of the citadel and arsenal, and the French tricolor supplanted the banner of St. Mark. But although Corfu was thus really in the possession of the French forces, under the command-in-chief of General Gentili, the appearance of liberty was preserved. A municipal council was formed. It was composed of the Latin Archbishop, of the Greek Protopapa, of two other ecclesiastics (one Greek, and the other Latin), of

* Capodistrias. But the permanent use of the Greek language was not possible without long preparations. The Italian was quickly resumed.

† Lunzi.

seven nobles, and lastly, of two Jews. The presidency of the council was, strange to say, offered in the first instance to the late Venetian Proveditor-General Carlo Widman. He had, however, been greatly beloved and respected, and had sacrificed all his plate to the necessities of the Government. But he, having declined the honour, Count Spiridion Theotoky was elected president by the unanimous votes of the council. Corfu now considered itself to be free and independent, and was as much so (says the Ionian historian) as a little girl in the midst of armed and powerful giants.*

The appointments of Jews to the municipal council excited to wrath the fanaticism of the Greeks. A great tumult arose. The Jews fled to the fortress, and their furious pursuers were with difficulty pacified by General Gentili.

Notwithstanding the occasional abuse of military power, and the reactionary struggles of parties, the people—in the opinion of an illustrious Ionian†—were happy, for they were delivered from the extortions and injustice to which they had been subjected under the oligarchical system of Venice. The democratic forms placed the administration in national hands; and the people being in immediate contact with the magistrates, who spoke their own language, no longer experienced the want of an interpreter in their own country.‡ The family

* Lunzi. "E Corcira si dice independente? Si! come lo sarebbe una fanciulla inerme in mezzo ad armati e poderosi giganti."

† Capodistrias. ‡ Capodistrias, Vandoncourt.

feuds and disasters, which had so long agitated Corfu, disappeared under the management of a severe and active police. The people felt the happiness of being delivered from a corrupt and feeble Government, and rejoiced in the hope of independence. For, in spite of revolutionary excesses, the aspect of France and Italy offered to the youth of the Seven Islands a glorious spectacle of advancing freedom and knowledge, by which they did not fail to profit.*

General Bonaparte constantly impressed upon the French Directory the value and importance of Corfu, both as regarded the commerce of the Adriatic and the strength of the citadel.† He thought, also, that Cephalonia was an important possession, but much less so than Corfu. Although Sir Charles Napier, misled by his natural feelings of partiality, would have substituted Cephalonia for Corfu as the military head-quarters of the Islands, such an opinion has never been shared by any other officer of reputation. Corfu is still unrivalled as the strongest and most valuable of Eastern fortresses. Bonaparte was of opinion, that in acquiring the Ionian Islands, France had gained the most precious part of all the Venetian dominions. But he, perhaps, somewhat exaggerated their importance in his great anxiety to increase the colonial possessions of France, as the only permanent means of rivalling England in the dominion of the Mediterranean.

* Capodistrias, Vandoncourt. † Daru.

Although General Gentili had the chief rule in the Ionian Islands, yet a respectable lawyer named Pierre Comeyras was appointed civil commissioner. But he arrived so late and stayed so short a period, that he could not have exercised much influence on the country.

On the 8th May, 1798, the first publication by the new national printing-office appeared. It was a manifesto in French, which declared the printing-office to be the first ever established in Greece. It also announced that if the former oppressors had removed all means for lifting the veil of ignorance, so favourable to tyrants, the new rulers, on the contrary, were resolved to spread light and civilization over those classic shores. It is an historical fact that the art of printing was up to that period wholly unknown to the Greeks!

The first check given to the popularity of the French republicans in the Ionian Islands was caused by the publication of the Treaty of Campo Formio, which exposed their hypocrisy in pretending to have come to Corfu only as the allies of Venice and of the Ionians. By the terms of that treaty, the Islands were formally ceded to the French Republic. The fair promises of the republicans were now no longer credited. They had, moreover, imprudently made some attempts to shake the supremacy of the Greek religion. They had, indeed, desisted on perceiving the great discontent of the

people, but the attempt increased their growing unpopularity.*

General Chabot, who had succeeded General Gentili, issued a proclamation announcing that the Islands were for ever united to France, and that for their defence Corfu would be provided with four hundred and eighty cannons and all other requisites.

The Latin Archbishop Fenzi complained of the spoiling of his churches; the ornaments and carpets of which had been appropriated to decorate and furnish the house of the French general. The greatest discontent prevailed amongst the Catholics also on account of the supremacy of which their religion had been deprived by the new rulers. Nor were the Greeks better pleased. Their Protopapa, Calichiopulo Manzaro, had at first taken part with the French. He had even proclaimed that their views were in accordance with Christian principles and the Gospel doctrines, and that therefore he had accepted the municipal office tendered to him by General Gentili.† But he did not long cherish such opinions. It does not, moreover, appear that the Greek clergy generally were docile to the orders and admonitions of the Protopapa in favour of the French. For General Chabot acquainted the former that he had given orders to arrest those priests who did not wear the tricolor cockade, and should re-

* Lunzi. † Ibid.

serve to himself the right of subsequently dealing with their offences.

On the 17th July, 1798, after being long expected, the Commissioner-General arrived at Corfu. The following month his appointment was revoked by the Directory; and on his way back to France he died at Ancona from the combined effects of fever and of grief at his recall.

At this period the power of France throughout the East was greatly weakened by the news of the battle of the Nile, and more especially in the Ionian Islands; over the fate of which the command of the Mediterranean must ever exercise the greatest influence. The declaration of war by Russia and Turkey against France was the first-fruit of Nelson's famous victory. The enemies of France were aided first by the treachery and then by the open hostility of Ali Pasha, the alliance between whom and the French had disgusted the Ionians and all the Greek race. Ali proceeded to attack the French troops in Albania. On the 4th October, 1798, General Chabot was compelled to abandon Butrinto, after blowing up the citadel, and to retire to Corfu. Prevesa was also taken and sacked by the Pasha, amidst the most horrible atrocities.

Cerigo and Zante successively surrendered to the allied Turks and Russians. Before surrendering, the Zantiots disgraced themselves by a massacre of the Jews in the Ghetto, or enclosed Jewish

quarter. This was done under pretence that the Jews were friendly to the French. But the Greeks were ever ready to massacre Jews if it could be done with impunity. At the same time there can be no doubt that the Jews were partial, because grateful, to the French. The Venetians had, indeed, issued decrees to protect the Jews from the Greeks; but the French, going much further, had endeavoured to raise them to an equality, an awful crime in the eyes of the Greek priests and of their bigoted followers.

Cephalonia was abandoned by the French, and the Russian flag was raised amidst cries of "Long live Paul!" The enthusiasm, however, of these cries was not unalloyed. The Ionians had, indeed, long cherished friendly feelings to their Russian co-religionists, and the rule of Russia alone would then have delighted them. But how could a Greek cordially hail a Turkish alliance? Nevertheless, the anger against the French caused even the Turks to be tolerated. Had not the French raised the accursed Jews to the level of the orthodox Greeks? The French garrison of Argostoli surrendered on condition of being conducted in safety to the fortress of Asso. But the soldiers were only preserved on the road from an infuriated peasantry by the influence of a merciful priest. They were finally made prisoners of war by the Russians. Santa Maura capitulated to the Russian admiral on the 17th November, 1798.

It appears that the garrison of Corfu was reduced at this time to 1500 infantry and 300 artillery-men. General Chabot, it is universally allowed, made a great mistake in not concentrating, on the first alarm of war, the whole of his small force in Corfu. He now laboured incessantly to improve the fortifications; but properly to defend the citadel and town, 450 cannons and 7000 infantry were considered necessary. Indeed, such a force, at least, will always be required by those defenders who have not the certain command of the sea.

General Chabot fortified also the island of Vido, which the French called the Island of the Peace. It was at that time covered with trees and verdure, and was used by the inhabitants as an agreeable retreat from the cares of the city. From the walls of the town or citadel it formed a lovely prospect to the spectator. The French cut the trees down, and the beautiful island was transformed into a strong and frowning entrenchment.

General Chabot assembled a number of nobles, citizens, and Jews, in order to consult with them on the measures to be taken and the contributions to be raised. He disarmed the citizens of Corfu. The inhabitants of Manducchio refused to give up their arms, and bravely defended Fort Abraham. They were, however, overcome. A convent was sacked by the French soldiers. Amongst the booty were costly lamps and chalices, and a Bible, the

binding of which was of solid silver. These General Chabot recovered from the hands of his own soldiers, and presented them to the church of St. Spiridion, through Peter Bulgari, whose family were, and still are, the patrons of that famous church.

Meanwhile, anarchy prevailed in the country, where the peasants endeavoured to take advantage of the horrors and confusion of war. They took up arms, and assailed the houses of the principal gentry, setting them on fire, and committing robberies and murders with impunity.

Seven of the allied vessels of war first arrived at Corfu. Soon after the Russian and Turkish admirals followed. Armed bodies of peasantry acted also in their service. One of these bands were under the command of a Cephalonian of the family of Metaxa. It had an encounter with a French detachment, which took them all prisoners and shot them immediately. Meantime, the Russian Admiral Uschakow appointed, as Superintendent of the island, Nicolas Bulgari, who was the enemy of France and the friend of Russia. Some of the Ionians still adhered to the French. In a skirmish which took place between the latter and a body of Albanians, a Cephalonian, named Migliaressi, distinguished himself on the side of the French. Seeing an Ottoman standard borne aloft on a height in the opposite ranks, he, accompanied by three French officers, galloped up into the midst of the enemy, and seized the detested flag. But at the same moment he and one of his companions fell

mortally wounded. An Albanian rushed forward and snatched the standard from the dead Ionian, whose hands still clutched it fiercely. But instantly four French grenadiers, surrounding the Albanian, took him prisoner, with the standard of the Crescent in his hand. The same Albanian was afterwards compelled to carry it through the city in triumphant procession, with the bodies of Migliaressi and of his companion, to which were paid the highest military honors. The gallantry of Migliaressi and of his French friend were the more admired when it was learnt that both these young men had conceived, before the battle, a strong presentiment of their approaching deaths, to which they afterwards rushed with such impetuous valour.*

Admiral Uschakow, with his Russians and Turks, stormed and took the island of Vido. The French lost on this occasion more than six hundred men, a third of whom were killed or wounded, and the remainder made prisoners. The Russians gave quarter, but the Turks slaughtered their prisoners without mercy. Mount Salvator was taken by a body of Turks, after a gallant defence by General Dufour.

The capture of Vido entailed the loss of Corfu, by permitting the erection of strong batteries against the citadel, the fire of which was supported by the batteries placed by the allies on the heights of San Pantaleon. In addition to this, the harbour

* Lunzi.

had become, by the loss of Vido, more accessible to the allied ships. These, besides the Russian and Turkish fleet, included an English frigate, under the command of Lord William Stuart, a man whose boldness and energy contributed to inspire confidence in the allies. A general assault could not have been long delayed, in which thousands of wild Albanians would have taken a part, thus ensuring the extermination of the valiant garrison, already reduced to 800 men. The citadel, therefore, surrendered. The garrison were granted all the honors of war, but were compelled to give up their stores, arms, and ammunition.

On the 5th of March, 1799, at ten A.M., the surrender took place, with naval and military pomp and ceremony. The people rent the air with cries of "Long live Paul; long live the Emperor!" All their enthusiasm was reserved for their co-religionists the Russians, for it was impossible, under any circumstances, for a Greek to fraternize sincerely with a Turk. In the midst of the cheering, Admiral Uschakow, having at his right hand the head of the Greek Church, and behind him a great suite of staff and attendants, proceeded to the famous church of St. Spiridion, to render thanks for the victory granted to the imperial arms, and for the liberation of the island from French dominion. The French garrison were transported to Toulon, and engaged not to serve against the allies for the period of eighteen months.

The capture of Corfu on this occasion, though an important political event, could not be considered a great military feat. Instead of 800, the French (as already stated) believed that 7000 soldiers were necessary for the complete defence of the citadel and town; especially when the command of the sea was in the hands of the enemy. With the loss of this celebrated fortress, so often besieged, but so seldom taken by force, ended the first or republican period of the French rule in the Ionian Islands. That rule, in spite of its many faults and excesses, had nevertheless been a great improvement on the vicious and antiquated system of Venice. From this time forth the middle classes, and even the peasantry, rose in the scale of human beings; and the nobles could no longer expect to monopolize for the future all the power of the State, and all the social advantages of civilization.

It is true that the base hypocrisy and selfishness, by which the French had obtained, without resistance, the mastery in the Islands, was deservedly punished by their rapid and ignominious expulsion. Nevertheless, the true and eternal principles of the French Revolution—those which correspond with the rights of humanity and with the wants of civilization—were not destined to be fruitless in the Ionian Islands. It was the French republicans who first gave a staggering blow to that rotten, political and social edifice, which had been the result of centuries of Venetian government. Necessary reforms

were introduced regarding the administration of justice, and the preservation of order; and the tyranny of the aristocracy was overturned. These virtues were acknowledged by the majority, in spite of offended bigotry and of outraged prejudices. But the misfortunes of the French could not but be their greatest crime in the eyes of a small and weak State, which never could hope, without foreign assistance or protection, to preserve any show of independence. When the French appeared to have lost the magic talisman of success, it was only natural that the Ionians should forget the benefits of their rule, and remember only what had offended them.

The French, whether as infidels or Roman Catholics, were equally hateful to the superstitious masses. Their alliance with Ali Pasha excited the disgust of the Ionians. Their falling into the trap laid for them by that horrible monster, superadded contempt to hatred. The Ionians (as I have already observed) regarded also with special horror a system which raised a Jew to the level of a Christian, and acknowledged him as a citizen equally entitled to equality, to liberty, and even to a share of political power. In addition, the French had against them all the nobles, who regretted their lost exclusive powers and privileges, and who were the most experienced of all the islanders in the management of public affairs, and of political intrigues. Nevertheless it is impossible to believe that it was not

with the greatest reluctance that the Ionians submitted to a protective alliance, of which the dreaded and detested Turk was (owing to the dissimulation then practised by Russia) ostensibly the chief presiding member.

I must now briefly touch on what remains of the History of the Islands, previous to the establishment of the Protectorate of Great Britain. Count Ermanno Lunzi of Zante has written an able history of the period from 1800 to 1807, for those who desire to know the details of the successive Turkish, Russian, and Imperial French Governments in the Islands.*

But these temporary masters did not very greatly change the characters of the Ionians. The centuries of Venetian rule had too deeply impressed the morals and manners; and as regards the upper classes, even the language of the country. The extraordinary and unnatural alliance between Russia and the Ottoman Porte, when displayed in a joint intervention in the government of the Ionian Islands, could not but lead to misery and confusion. It is idle and unjust to blame the Ionians for what followed. None can believe that they would ever have submitted, without compulsion, to the protectorate of the Grand Turk. None can credit that they should have willingly consented to become the respectful vassals of the hereditary enemy of their race and creed. That Russia and Turkey would combine harmoniously to

* Della Republica Settinsulare del Conte Ermanno Lunzi.

ensure the prosperity of the Ionian Islands was equally improbable. Russia conceded to Turkey the nominal supremacy, but rendered it null by her intrigues and interference. The Ionians, moreover, naturally preferred their co-religionists, and would, doubtless, have joyfully accepted the sole protectorate of Russia.

The Turks allied themselves with the aristocracy, and endeavoured to restore the ancient exclusive system of Venice. The Russians took the democratic side, in order to oppose the Turks. The agents of other nations mingled in the intrigues.*

At this time the long dominion of Venice had banished the national language from amongst the educated classes. These spoke and wrote the Venetian dialect, which is so inferior to the pure Tuscan. The masses used a barbarous jargon, which it was profanation to style Greek, that noblest of all languages.† All that was then required to complete the degradation of the ancient and classic Ionian people was the domination of the Turks. Let it not be cast in their teeth that they rebelled against such humiliation. Had they not done so, they would have been deserving of the contempt of civilized nations. In some respects the new order of things flattered their pride. The Islands were officially styled "The Septinsular Republic," and

* Capodistrias's memorandum, 1815.

† It is unfortunately in this jargon that the cleverest and most original of Ionians, Signor A. Lascarato, has written all such of his works as are not composed in Italian.

the first spectacle was presented to the world of an acknowledged Greek State, with its own national flag. Self-government also was instituted, if the rule of a single class can be so considered. The Russian Admiral Uschakow, however, had more power and influence than the Sultan of Turkey, and used it without scruple. Yet the Islands all fell into confusion, especially Zante and Cephalonia. The latter, as if to multiply disorder, combined internal with external hatred; and the inhabitants of Argostoli and Lixuri, the two principal towns, detested each other almost as much as they did the Turks. They actually attacked and invaded one another's territories. Civil war also raged in Cerigo. Santa Maura alone remained tranquil—a fact highly creditable to the inhabitants.* But many of the Ionians could not fail to come to blows with the Turks. Constant and sanguinary riots took place. The Turkish garrisons, no doubt with the approbation of Russia, were soon compelled to quit all the Islands except Corfu.

In Zante there were internecine quarrels between the nobles and the people; the former having monopolized all the power. The island soon after proclaimed its independence, and *spontaneously* determined to place itself under the protection of Great Britain. On the 20th of February, 1801, the English ensign was raised on the fort, the standards of Russia and Turkey being removed. Internal dis-

* Lunzi.

sensions had prevented as yet, it appears, the raising of the national standard. The English ambassador at Constantinople speedily expressed through Mr. Forest, consul at Corfu, the disgust of the King of England at the unauthorized use of his flag by parties in Zante hostile to the Porte. An English adventurer and impostor, named Callender, had been the cause of this act of folly, which was thus disowned by the English Government.

On the 23rd of March, 1801, the Emperor Paul was assassinated at St. Petersburg. Some months after Alexander ascended the throne, the Russian and Turkish troops abandoned Corfu in virtue of a secret treaty which had been made at Paris on the 10th of October, 1800, between the First Consul and the Emperor Alexander. The Russians and Turks embarked on the same day, August 13, 1801. But the nominal Protectorate of Turkey continued.

Left to themselves, the Corfiots annulled the constitution of 1800 and formed a new one, increasing the power of Signor Theotoky, the President of the Senate. A single Assembly (with delegated executive), representing all classes of society, each class electing its own members, was the singular government adopted spontaneously by the Ionians. It was based upon universal suffrage, qualified by division of classes. But when in the history of the world did a single assembly of any kind, possessed of unchecked and unlimited power, govern wisely or well? Was it likely to succeed in a half-civilized

race, debased and corrupted by ages of misrule and frequent change of masters?

On the 26th of September, 1801, peace was made between France and Turkey, and the Septinsular Republic was duly acknowledged by the former power. In January, 1802, the treaty of Amiens established a universal peace. In consequence, the Republic of the Seven Islands, under the protection of Turkey, was duly recognized by all the powers of Europe. But the internal troubles continued, and a special embassy was sent from Corfu to St. Petersburg to obtain the Emperor's aid and interference. The President of the Senate, moreover, sent a request to Malta that the protection of the British squadron might not be withdrawn from Corfu. He feared that the revolutionary state of Zante and the disturbances in the other islands might be made an excuse by the Turks for re-landing. Soon afterwards Russia, in concert with Turkey and with England (which was anxious to retain the friendship of Alexander), determined to send a plenipotentiary to Corfu to regulate the government as had been requested by the leading inhabitants. Count George Mocenigo of Zante was the officer selected for the purpose by Alexander. Meantime, the English had conveyed a few troops into the fortress of Corfu. These, united with the local militia, were sufficient to defend their posts and to keep the town in check. But they did not suffice to preserve the country in peace and order. There the

peasants scoured the fields, committing robbery, arson, exactions, and general destruction of property. Admiral Keith, moreover, soon recalled the British squadron to Malta. Only one ship and a few soldiers were left at Corfu, and this at the earnest request of the Senate, who for this small boon sent their grateful thanks to the English Government.

But the arrival of Count Mocenigo and the Russian troops restored order to the Septinsular Republic, which, left to itself, had plunged into helpless anarchy. Russian bayonets speedily tranquillized the peasantry. The President of the Senate, Spiridion Theotoky, appears to have laboured with zeal and diligence to add the moral force of persuasion to the physical force of the Russian Plenipotentiary. Regular governments under regents were appointed in all the Islands.*

Towards the close of 1802, Colonel Sebastiani, in a French frigate, touched at Zante. As he could not land in consequence of a fear of the plague, he addressed a letter to the regent in the name of the First Consul. Its terms shadowed forth the approaching French Empire. For Colonel Sebastiani recommended to the Ionians a mixed form of government. They would thus combine (the colonel informed them) the force and rapidity of monarchy, and the vigilance and intelligence of aristocracy,

* *Pritano* was the title given to the regents in the time of Russia.

with the vigour and elevation of democracy. Surely wiser advice was never given. But the monarch—where was he to come from? Perhaps the candid reply would have been *Paris*. A French party now began to be formed in the Islands, exciting in some degree the jealousy of the Russians.

The Senate of Corfu continued to be the head of the Government, subject to the Russian Plenipotentiary. It was determined now to call a Legislative Assembly. The Senate, by a decree of the 22nd of January, 1803, regulated the formation of the electoral colleges. The name of Sincliti* was now first given to the voters. The Sincliti were not allowed the free nomination of the legislators. *They were obliged to choose from a double list of candidates proposed by the Government.*† To be native born, to profess the Christian religion, to be of irreproachable conduct, and not to be an artisan, or a shopkeeper, or labourer, was required of the voters. Further, they were to possess a yearly revenue of at least four hundred dollars in Corfu, and of a proportionately smaller revenue in the other six islands. The new Parliament consisted of a Senate of seventeen members, and of an Assembly of forty members.

Count Mocenigo, as Russian Plenipotentiary, and with a powerful army at his back, was now the

* Called, in Italian, *Convocati*.

† Lunzi. This measure, first carried out by an Ionian in the name of Russia, was adpoted in 1817 by Sir Thomas Maitland.

chief ruler of Corfu, and a regular government was established. In June, his Majesty George the Third named a minister to reside in the island, as had been done in the time of Venice. Mr. Spiridion Forest, an Englishman, whose mother had been a Greek, was the person appointed to the post. The Russian Plenipotentiary appears to have held much the same office as was afterwards filled by the English Lord High Commissioner. The famous Count John Capodistrias was the chief secretary of the State in 1803, commencing that career which was destined to become so illustrious, and to terminate so fatally. The President of the Senate, by the constitution of 1803, had also the title of Prince. By investing him with this high honor, the Russians flattered the people, and gave the appearance at least of independence to the Republic.*

On the 3rd of December, 1803, the guns of the fortress announced the acceptation by the Assembly of the constitution made by the Russian Plenipotentiary. Public rejoicings and religious ceremonies followed. Great expressions of gratitude were forwarded to St. Petersburg. The President, Count Spiridion George Theotoky, died full of honors in the course of December; and Signor Antonio Comuta was the first Prince of the Republic, and President of the Senate under the new constitution.

* This title was not conceded to the President of the Senate under the British Protectorate.

The constitution of 1803 put a final period to the exclusive Venetian system, which had restricted to the nobles all the rights of electors; though some property and respectability were still required, sufficient to restrict to the upper classes all political influence. It granted the ballot: but by fraud and Russian bayonets combined this boon was rendered illusory.* The money qualifications for electors was dispensed with in the case of those Ionians who had received diplomas in laws or medicine. But in those days the nobles alone obtained such certificates. That these were considered so honorable, is a proof rather of the poverty of the Ionian gentry than of any liberality of sentiment. The constitution made some laws, one of which is deserving of mention. It ordained that no bachelor who did not marry within a certain period (to be afterwards regulated) was to be allowed to be registered amongst the Sincliti.

The Turks were naturally disgusted at the manner in which the Russians had treated them, who were the legal protectors of the Seven Islands; but they were unable to obtain any redress. The Emperor of Russia generously exempted the Septinsular Republic from all military payments.

On the fresh outbreak of war between France

* Colonel Leake was present in 1806 at the elections of Santa Maura. The Sincliti met in a church, guarded by Russian soldiers. "In fact," writes the Colonel, "not one of those present is ignorant that the meeting is a farce, and that the legislators have been named a fortnight ago by M. the emissary of the Russian Plenipotentiary. But this does not prevent the ceremony of a ballot."

and England, neutrality was at first attempted by Russia. She also strove to convert into a corrupt despotism the constitution of the Seven Islands. The state of Europe and fears of France may palliate, but cannot justify such policy.

The next Assembly was elected by a combination of fraud and threats, and met on the 30th of October, 1806. It proceeded, with a view to please Count Mocenigo, to name a committee to examine his proposed reforms in the constitution. The new constitution was presented to the vote of Assembly by Count Capodistrias on the 28th of December, 1806. It is useless to go into its details. It destroyed all real liberty and independence, and placed the Islands at the mercy of the Russian Plenipotentiary and of his chosen tools. The reforms duly passed; the President of the Assembly concluding his slavish speech on that occasion with these words: "We are born to obey, and not to command."* Alexander had the decency to refuse a statue from such an Assembly; requesting them to spend the money which they had voted on some public establishment.

In 1807 war between Russia and Turkey next broke out, the latter supported by France, and England joining the former.† Turkey sent to de-

* "Noi siamo nati ad obbedienza, e non al comando."—*Lanzi.*

† "So desirous was the Russian Emperor of humbling the Turks, that he courted the aid of Great Britain against them. The King, unwilling to disoblige so powerful an ally, whose friendship he wished to secure, ordered Sir John Duckworth to enter the Dardanelles, and offer terms at the point of the cannons." Five Turkish vessels were destroyed by the English, but the friendship of Alexander was not secured.—Russell's *Modern Europe.*

mand assistance from its vassal the Septinsular Republic. Mocenigo caused the Senate to send the cutting reply that the Islands were indebted for their existence, when about to perish in anarchy, to the arms of Russia, who alone was able to protect them.

Santa Maura being threatened by Ali Pasha, Count Capodistrias was nominated Commissioner Extraordinary to that island, to arrange its defence, with the aid of the Klephts from the mainland. He lost no time in digging ditches and raising ramparts, and exciting the inhabitants to make a gallant defence. Zante, Cephalonia, and the other islands all sent assistance to Santa Maura, actuated by that spirit of valour which in Greeks is never so powerfully displayed as against the detested enemies of the Cross, the savage followers of the Crescent.

A treacherous clause in the Treaty of Tilsit, signed on the 25th of June, 1807, handed over the Seven Islands to the Emperor Napoleon. The reign of the Russian Plenipotentiary, Count Mocenigo, came to an end. Neither he himself in Corfu, nor his subordinates in the lesser islands, left behind them good reputations. Coercion and corruption, both political and social, disgraced the rule of Russia in the Islands, in spite of the benevolent intentions of the Emperor Alexander, which he had displayed by appointing an Ionian noble to be his representative.

In the following August, the French, under

General Berthier, took possession of the Islands, which were so highly valued by his sovereign. At first only 1500 soldiers arrived. But the garrison was soon after increased to a total of about 6000 men. Berthier was directed to treat the inhabitants with kindness, to leave them their constitution, and to make himself beloved and popular: but he had no sooner arrived, on the 23rd of August, 1807, than he commenced to play the part of despot. He not only occupied the citadel, but he hauled down the Septinsular flag, and raised that of France in its stead. Arbitrarily creating himself Governor-General, he regulated the administration of the Islands by his sole will, proclaiming that they formed a part of the French Empire. This the Emperor disapproved, as contrary to his wish and intention; but he tacitly accepted the fruits. The Islands now submitted to the sway of Imperial France. The decree of Fontainebleau, dated the 10th of November, 1807, confirmed, with few exceptions, all the acts of the French general. To the governor-general was to be added a civil commissary, to be present at and to superintend the debates of the Senate, which was allowed to continue in office. The governor-general, however, provided he obtained the consent of the civil commissary, was empowered, in case of urgent necessity, to suspend all law and authority, and to act at discretion. After the Treaty of Tilsit, hostilities broke out between England and Russia. In

consequence, amongst the potentates against whom England formally declared war, on this occasion, the Ionian Islands were expressly named.

The French imperialist sway lasted more than seven years in Corfu, but not three in Zante and Cephalonia. General Berthier, too harsh and rough a soldier to please the French Emperor, was soon recalled, and the amiable and excellent General Donzelot was appointed to be governor-general in his stead. The latter has left the reputation of being the most popular ruler who ever landed in the Seven Islands.* Gentle and conciliating, though firm, he won the respect and affection of the Ionians, especially of the Corfiots, amongst whom he lived. Zante and Cephalonia, nevertheless, pining for freedom and independence, and disgusted at being incorporated with France, sent appeals for assistance to Great Britain.

In the autumn of 1809, an expedition, under the command of Admiral Lord Collingwood and of General Oswald, took possession, with scarcely any resistance, of Zante and Cephalonia. A little later, Santa Maura and Ithaca also fell into the hands of the English. General Oswald issued a proclamation on the 4th of October, 1809, in which he promised protection and redress of wrongs, liberty of conscience, and personal freedom and security. He

* Baron Theotoky records that a school of medicine in the Ionian Academy, "fut établie en 1809 par un Corcyrean, à la faveur de l'état paisible que Corfou devait aux soins du Général Donzelot, pendant que la guerre répandait la crainte sur ses côtés." Count Capodistrias was the founder and first secretary of this school of medicine.

appointed English officers to the civil and military government of the Islands, with a council of natives. Colonel (afterwards Sir Hudson) Lowe was made Governor of Cephalonia in the first instance, and subsequently his command was extended over the four southern islands. The good government established in Corfu by the French does not appear to have extended to the southern islands, which were found garrisoned chiefly by Italian regiments when taken by the British.

The capture of Santa Maura gave some trouble to the English, in consequence of the gallant defence of the French; whose chief was, nevertheless, tried by court-martial by Napoleon for not holding out longer. The English fleet blockaded but could not take Corfu, on account of the strength of the fortifications and the garrison. The abdication of the Emperor and the restoration of the Bourbons put an end, in 1814, to the French rule in Corfu. The subordinate islands were by that time accustomed to the energetic and just, though somewhat despotic sway of the English commanders. But the Ionians cherished sanguine hopes that a general peace would restore their independence and self-government. General Campbell, who now held the chief command in Corfu, maintained the Senate in its post, and whilst he was supreme himself, he yet conciliated the Ionians. So popular was he, that when the Treaty of Paris of 5th November, 1815, became known, the most respectable

Corfiots petitioned the English Government to appoint the general as the first Lord High Commissioner to the Islands. This request was not complied with. But the particulars of the Treaty of Paris belong not to this introduction, but to the "History of the British Protectorate." I will, therefore, only observe, in conclusion, that the reader who has studied the preceding pages will be the more able to judge impartially of the merits and demerits of the English rulers of the Seven Islands

HISTORY OF THE BRITISH PROTECTORATE

OF

THE IONIAN ISLANDS.

CHAPTER I.

SIR THOMAS MAITLAND, THE FIRST LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1816 TO 1824.]

The Treaty of Paris, 1815—Sir Thomas Maitland, First Lord High Commissioner—His rough Character—Convivial Habits—Despotic Conduct—His Plans and Preparations—Proclamation, 1816—Primary Council—Address of his Excellency—The first Legislative Assembly—Sir Thomas Maitland's Opening Speech—Constitution of 1817—Power of the Perpetual Veto—The Judges—Supreme Council—High Police Powers—Merits of Sir Thomas Maitland—His Measures—Wants of the Ionians—Discontents regarding Parga—War of Independence—Execution of the Patriarch of Constantinople—Disturbances at Zante—Colonel Napier in Cephalonia—Financial Measures—Death of Sir Thomas Maitland—His Character and Reputation in the Islands—Temple and Statue.

It was not till May, 1814, that Corfu surrendered to the English. In vain had the latter, not venturing to assault the fortress, endeavoured, since 1809, to reduce it by blockade. Neither the capture of the other six islands, nor the command of the sea, was of any avail. But, after the first

fall of Napoleon, in consequence of orders from Louis XVIII., Corfu was surrendered by the brave and respected General Donzelot to the English forces under General Sir Robert Campbell.* The British flag now waved supreme throughout the Seven Islands. Nevertheless, Great Britain could not, in justice, consider herself the sole arbitress of their future destinies. The surrender of Corfu was due to the general success of the Allied Powers. Nor could the other six islands (excepting, perhaps, Santa Maura, which was captured after a brave resistance) be considered as conquered countries. In fact, the English naval and military chiefs had disavowed all selfish ideas of conquest on arriving in the Islands. They had confessedly taken temporary possession of them, at the request of some of their most respectable inhabitants, who were anxious to throw off the French yoke, and to regain their liberty and independence. England has been accused of having, at the Congress of Vienna, claimed the Islands, at first by right of conquest,† but this appears to be an unfounded calumny. Indeed, in the first instance, Lord Castlereagh proposed to the English Prime Minister that the Emperor of Austria, or some Italian Prince, should undertake the protection of the Islands.‡ But Count Capodistrias assured the English ambassador that the Ionians would prefer

* The strength of the French garrison of Corfu, in 1814, is said to have been more than ten thousand men.

† Lenormant's Iles Ioniennes. ‡ Jervis.

the protection of Great Britain. The representations of the Count had great weight. The fate of the Islands was submitted, finally, to that Congress in whose decision the claims of Great Britain were sure to be favourably considered, for the sake of the great services which she had rendered to the alliance against France; and also on account of her actual possession of the Islands. As soon as Congress had resolved that these should be formed into an independent state, under the protection of some great power, it became evident that the claims of England, if pressed, would prevail. The Emperor Alexander made no pretensions to the protectorate. He must, indeed, have felt that his treacherous conduct, in giving the Islands over to the Emperor Napoleon, at the Treaty of Tilsit, in 1807, incapacitated him from taking such a part. Moreover, his natural benevolence, and the liberal spirit that animated him at that time, inclined him to blot out his former treachery by present kindness to the Ionians. To this course of conduct he was the more encouraged by a distinguished Ionian, long in his service, and whom he had appointed one of his plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Vienna. This was the famous Count Capodistrias, a noble Corfiot, destined to take so prominent a part in Greek affairs, and to perish, in 1831, by the hands of assassins, after he had become the ruler of resuscitated Greece. Count Capodistrias had, at first (with the aid of the Ionian Senate),

attempted to persuade the Emperor Alexander to establish the Seven Islands as an entirely free, separate, and independent state. But the Emperor was too well acquainted with their history and actual condition to countenance such a scheme.* Foiled in his views, the Count now strongly advocated the protectorate of England. In this he was actuated by a patriotic desire to ensure the prosperity and the happiness of his country, by placing it under the protection of the freest country in Europe. The only rival to England was Austria, which laid its claim before Congress as heir to the rights of Venice, to which the Islands had so long been subjected. But when this proposal was rejected, the Emperor of Austria at once sided with England, and the protectorate of the latter became a certainty. The escape of Napoleon from Elba, and the renewal of the war, deferred the settlement of the question. But it was re-opened at Paris, where, finally, on the 5th of November, 1815, the definite treaty was signed.

By the Treaty of Paris the Ionian Islands were formed into a free and independent state, and were placed under the exclusive protection of the King of Great Britain. There is every reason to believe that although the treaty was eventually signed by all the principal powers of Europe (except France), yet the details were chiefly regulated by Viscount Castlereagh and Count Capodistrias.†

* Jervis. † Vide Appendix B, for the Treaty of Paris.

In a series of well-written memoranda, the Ionian Count placed his ideas before the able Minister of England; and although his proposals were not carried out to the letter, he undoubtedly contributed greatly to the formation of the nine articles which constituted the Treaty of Paris. Amongst the important signatures to that treaty were those of the Duke of Wellington and of Prince Metternich. But there is no reason to believe that either of those very conservative statesmen took much part in arranging its confused and contradictory details. Indeed, if we consider the characters (at that epoch of the Holy Alliance) of the potentates of Europe, and of their statesmen, no sane man can believe that the Congress of Sovereigns had any intention of setting up a real republic in the long-distracted and turbulent Ionian Islands.* The very idea is preposterous; and is, moreover, quite inconsistent with nearly all the articles of the Treaty of Paris. The first article, indeed, provides that the Seven Islands should be formed into "one sole, free, and independent state, under the name of the United States of the Ionian Islands." But the provisions of the subsequent articles are quite inconsistent with complete independence. The 2nd Article declares the United States to be "placed

* "The policy of the four courts was simply and blindly anti-revolutionary, and they substituted for the rule of Napoleon a rule nearly as full of evil—their own. . . . . Well might Mr. Horner write, in 1815, 'It is a question whether the very first principle of slavery, that people are the property of certain royal families, is now to be established as a fundamental axiom of Europe.'"—Hooper's *Waterloo*.

under the *immediate and exclusive protection*" of the King of Great Britain. The 3rd Article gives the States "the power to regulate their interior organization," but "with the approbation of the protecting power." By the same article the King was to "dedicate his particular solicitude to the legislation and general administration of the States," and to appoint a resident Lord High Commissioner, to be invested with the necessary authority for that purpose.

Article 4 gave the Lord High Commissioner very general and undefined powers regarding the convocation and direction of the Assembly, "which was to establish the charter of a new constitution," "which his Majesty was to be requested to ratify." The only limitation to the powers of the Lord High Commissioner was the vague direction that he was to found "the political organization upon that organization which was actually in force."

Article 5 gave to the King the right to occupy the forts and territories, and to place garrisons in them; which, including the military forces of the States, were to be placed under the orders of an English commander. This article appears to imply that the States had troops of their own. But there was no stipulation that such native troops were to be maintained for the future.

Article 6 arranged that a convention should be made between the King and the States to regulate the maintenance of the forts, and the subsistence

and pay of the garrisons; as also the numbers of these last in time of peace.

Article 7 regulated the commerce and separate flags of the States; and Articles 8 and 9 related to the formalities of the treaty. Certainly this document, to which is appended the signatures of so many celebrated personages, is sadly confirmatory of the famous saying of the Swedish statesman:—"with how little wisdom the world is governed." It began by proclaiming the complete independence of the Islands, and then quietly proceeded to place them completely at the mercy of England. It does not argue much for the political acumen of Count Capodistrias, that he appears to have sincerely believed that the freedom and independence of his country was really established by the Treaty of Paris. According to the ideas of some Ionian and French authors, England was merely to defend the Islands with her navies and armies, permitting the Ionians to do whatever they pleased in their own internal affairs. If they chose to renew those internecine conflicts, which had compelled the first Septinsular Republic to appeal to the Russian Emperor, it was to be nothing to England. If the ancient Venetian system of corruption, venality, and tyranny, were re-established, England was to look on calmly; content simply to defend the Islands from foreign aggression. It has been already shown that the framers of the Treaty of Paris could never have contemplated such complete

independence, as too many Ionians fondly anticipated for their small country.* The only fear of the then most influential of all the Continental statesmen, Prince Metternich, must have been lest England should grant the Islands too democratic a constitution.† The past history of the Islands had convinced the Conservative European statesmen, that the Ionians were as little able to govern as they were to defend themselves. Indeed, the Congress of Sovereigns must have believed that it had been unusually liberal in leaving the future destiny of the Islands in the hands of the freest of European governments. There was, moreover, a significant omission in the treaty. A free and independent State, without a King, is assuredly a Republic; and the Ionians were to the last fond of calling their Islands "the Septinsular Republic." But the word *Republic* is not to be found in any of the nine articles of the Treaty of Paris, which so repeatedly name the *King* of Great Britain. Nor is there any clause permitting an appeal against his Majesty's decisions being made to the powers who

* Count Capodistrias's memorandum was rather confused and even self-contradictory, in regard to his views of the degree of interference to be exercised by the Protectorate. In one place he says that the latter "ne devrait permettre dans aucun cas, à ses agens de prendre une part immédiate à la confection des lois, ou à l'administration du pays." Later he declares that "la puissance protectrice doit pouvoir s'assurer d'une manière réelle et positive que les législateurs et les gouvernans n'ont d'autre but et d'autre intention en exécutant les fonctions de leurs places, que de consolider la prospérité de leur patrie."

† "C'est dans cette vue que la constitution a été redigée lorsque les maximes de la veille Europe d'une côté, et l'état intérieur des îles de l'autre, n'était pas fait pour favoriser les idées libérales."—*Détails sur Corfou*, Baron Theotoky.

signed the convention. This view of the case actuated the Primary Council in forming the constitution of 1817. If the intention on the part of the allies had been to require from the protecting power some observance of the forms of liberty and independence, with very little of their reality, then the treaty would have been comprehensible. But in that case Count Capodistrias would not have appended his signature to it without a remonstrance. Relying too much on the plain terms of the first article, he deceived himself as to the general tenor of the treaty. There can be no doubt that, from the beginning, the British Government must have felt that practically the Seven Islands had become complete dependencies of Great Britain. With every intention to act with justice, it required time, experience, and more local knowledge than they then possessed, for the English Ministers to decide with confidence as to the amount of liberty and of self-government that might be safely bestowed on the Islands. They had to consider the happiness and prosperity of the people committed to their charge; and also the safety of a strong fortress like Corfu, then considered of little less importance than Gibraltar or Malta. For its possession completed the command of the Mediterranean, and greatly increased the influence of Great Britain in the east of Europe. The ignorance prevailing in England regarding the Islands, and the indifference of Parliament, and of

the public to distant foreign dependencies (especially when small), has ever given great importance to the individual occupying the post of Lord High Commissioner, to which the vagueness of the Treaty of Paris had given almost unlimited powers. But, above all, the first Lord High Commissioner had an important and difficult task to perform; he had, in fact, to create an entirely new government —almost a new state. True, he would be responsible to the Colonial Minister, and eventually to Parliament; but experience has proved both in his case, and in that of his successors, how very nominal such responsibility may be. Nor is this surprising when we consider that the differences of language, religion, and customs, render it difficult for all at a distance, and for many even on the spot, to understand the true merits of the local questions and disputes that constantly arise. In despair of arriving at the truth, amidst that conflict of evidence, which is more common amongst Greeks than amongst any other people, the English Ministers have usually saved themselves much anxiety and trouble, by confiding entirely in the Lord High Commissioner of the day. When a gentleman of ability, long employed in the Islands, published his opinion a few years ago, that the history of the Ionian Islands was the history of the Lord High Commissioners, he by no means exaggerated the case as regards the English Pro-

tectorate.* He, in fact, only repeated in other words what Sir Charles (then Colonel) Napier had published many years previously.†

The first Lord High Commissioner was the Honourable Sir Thomas Maitland, brother to the Earl of Lauderdale. He was a general officer, and already Governor of Malta.‡ He was a man of great abilities, and much respected; but his energy, resolution, and soldierlike frankness, would have attracted more admiration, had they not been counterbalanced by an excessive coarseness and roughness of language and manner, which made him many enemies. But even these could find no fault in his morals, excepting with regard to the extraordinary lengths to which he carried his hospitable conviviality. To a temperate race like the Greeks, this weakness appeared very despicable; but it was undoubtedly the fault rather of the age than of the man. In fact, as is well known, hard drinking was, fifty years ago, exceedingly fashionable in Great Britain and Ireland. A gentleman in those days who wished to be honored by high-born beauty, was obliged to show that he could drink at least two bottles of port after dinner

* Sir George Bowen, in a pamphlet published in 1851.

† Colonel Napier, in his "Colonies," thus expressed himself: "The Ionian Islands are called independent states; but must be considered as a colony belonging to England, with a constitution of their own, that renders the Lord High Commissioner perfectly despotic. *He is therefore the person from whom all the good and all the evil acts of the Government emanate.*"

‡ In Malta he was styled "King Tom," in consequence of his determined and despotic character.

without inconvenience; but to acquire this power of endurance much practice was doubtless necessary. Noble and even illustrious personages were sometimes found under the table, to which on the previous evening they had sat down with the dignity and decorum suited to their rank and position. In the case of Sir Thomas Maitland, political animosity has exaggerated a defect, which was but too common to his contemporaries generally.

Sir Thomas Maitland arrived in Corfu in February, 1816. He took over the government from General Sir Robert Campbell, and continued for some time to rule the Islands with an autocratic authority similar to that exercised by his predecessor. Indeed, he went further, for he abolished the Senate, which Sir Robert Campbell and even the French Imperial Government had respected, at least in form. Before taking any steps to grant a constitution, he spent some months in visiting the Islands, and making himself acquainted with their wants and the condition of the inhabitants. In the mean time he permitted no public expression of opinion, whether by the press or otherwise. He consulted a few of the principal people, but formed his own plans. He adopted very decidedly the opinion that the people were wholly unfit for constitutional government, in the British sense of the words.* His natural character,

* Count Capodistrias protested to the English Government against the

which was very despotic, doubtless influenced his judgment; but facts and experience in some degree justified his determination. He resolved to prepare the Ionians for that future political freedom for which he deemed them as yet unfit, but to maintain for the present a dictatorship in his own hands. Sir Thomas Maitland proceeded to England to make his report, and to obtain instructions, and he appears to have received full power to carry out his plans.

The 4th article of the Treaty of Paris authorized the Lord High Commissioner to regulate the forms for convoking a Legislative Assembly, the operation of which he was to direct in order to draw up a new constitutional charter. The spirit of this article certainly required that the Assembly should really represent the people; but the indistinct letter left all to the discretion of the Lord High Commissioner. The total number of voters at that period was only about three or four hundred in Corfu; and in the other islands proportionably less. Sir Thomas therefore resolved not to alter materially the manner of voting already in force; as the small number of voters, still styled the noble electors, rendered it the easier for him to carry out his plans. He determined that all future Assemblies should meet in the same manner as the

despotism of Sir Thomas Maitland; but when made President of Greece, in 1829, he himself decided that the continental Greeks were unfit for constitutional liberty; and he was in 1831 assassinated as a despot and enemy of liberty.

first one was about to do, thus fixing beforehand a part of that constitution which the Assembly was summoned to establish. He began by forming a primary council of ten gentlemen and a president, in whom he could confide. The Primary Council was to draw up the rules by which the members of the Assembly were to be elected, and to prepare the constitutional charter, which was to be laid before them for adoption and approval. For, however unfit for self-government the Ionians might be, England was bound by the Treaty of Paris to grant some kind of constitution. Probably the best practical government at the moment would have been one formed on the principle which of old regulated the crown colonies, and composed of a governor and council. Half of the council might have been named by the representative of the crown, and half freely elected by a moderately extended constituency. By means of a president named by the Government, the majority would have been secured to the English chief, whilst the influence of the public would still have been strongly felt in the council. But the Treaty of Paris rendered such a plan impossible. Determined, therefore, as Sir Thomas was, as to the necessity of a dictatorship, there remained no way but to give to the Ionians the forms without the reality of freedom. But he was not contented with this, or else he would have been satisfied with securing to his Government a good

working majority. But as he had silenced the press, so he determined that the voice of opposition should not be heard in the new Assembly. On the 19th of September, 1816, he wrote a proclamation, which was published in Greek and Italian,* setting forth his intentions. He began by acquainting the Ionians that it was not likely that Great Britain, to which had been granted the exclusive protectorate over the Islands, would tolerate revolutionary measures in them. To oppose and overthrow these, had been, he declared, the principal work of the allies, and Great Britain had herself made many sacrifices to that end. The protecting power would give them such liberty as suited the circumstances of the Ionians and the rights of the protection. He told them that experience was the first requisite for good government. He condemned in strong terms the vices of the Venetian rule. He promised them to introduce good measures. He praised the Emperor Alexander for having saved the Ionians, formerly, from themselves. But he condemned the constitution of 1803 as a proved misfortune and failure. The proclamation concluded with a complimentary allusion to the Primary Council, which he was about to assemble at Corfu, and which was to be composed of gentlemen selected by the Lord High Commissioner, in the proportion of two from each

* The Italian versions, as the language hitherto chiefly used, is that which I have studied and quoted in most of the documents of the earlier Lord High Commissioners.

of the three larger, and one from each of the four smaller islands.

Sir Thomas Maitland appointed his friend, Baron Theotoky,* President of the Primary Council. This Ionian, an amiable man, and a pleasing author, has been the object of much obloquy for the manner in which he supported the English Protectorate in the Islands. Certainly his zeal was well rewarded. But nevertheless it is probable that the Baron really believed that the Protectorate of England, if despotically administered in the first instance, would the more surely contribute to the prosperity and tranquillity of his poor and distracted country, where the hand of a master was imperatively necessary.

Having assembled his Primary Council, Sir Thomas Maitland addressed to it a discourse on the 3rd of February, 1817; which was little else than a repetition of the proclamation which he had published the year before, and was intended to prepare them for a small instalment of liberty and power. He reminded them that, by two articles of the treaty, the military occupation of the States was for ever granted to Great Britain, at whose mercy he insinuated that they were placed, but on whose generosity and love of justice he assured them that they could confidently rely.

In this speech he justly condemned the manner

* Son of the Count Spiridion Theotoky, President of the Senate in the time of the Turks and Russians.

in which the constitution of 1803 had caused the judges to be elected by the people, just like the legislators; and he declared that in future all judicial arrangements must be left to the executive. He expressed his regret that at the approaching election of the Legislature, he could not allow of an unlimited freedom of choice. He added, that to the welfare of the masses the forms of government were not important, but that their happiness and prosperity depended on its substantial acts and benefits. He promised practical reforms and improvements, and especially the distribution of vigorous and impartial justice. Finally, the Lord High Commissioner claimed the merit of not taking advantage of that clause of the Treaty of Paris, which directed a convention to be made with the Ionian State for the payment of the expenses of the forts and garrisons. He probably felt that the revenue of the Islands could not, consistently with their prosperity, bear so great a burden.*

After a polite reply from the President Theotoky, the Primary Council commenced its duties, which were to carry out the plans of Sir Thomas Maitland in convoking the first Legislative Assembly. The following were the principal details. The Assembly was to consist of forty members; of these,

* A parliamentary return, called for 30th of June, 1863, states that "the payments for military protection commenced in 1818." But Sir Charles Napier, an excellent authority, states that Sir Thomas Maitland only charged the Ionian finances with the lodging of troops. Sir Frederick Adam added a great sum for fortifications and other military expenses, sanctioned by his obsequious Assembly.

the President and members of the Primary Council were to form eleven integral members. The remaining twenty-nine were to be chosen by the electors from the double lists of candidates,* drawn up by the Primary Council, who were the mere servants of the Lord High Commissioner. But even this small power of selection from a double list, nominally left to the voters, was not really exercised. The Government candidates were everywhere elected without opposition. The Islands returned members as follows:

Corfu	7
Cephalonia	8
Zante	7
Santa Maura	4
Ithaca	1
Cerigo	1
Paxo	1
Total	29

The electors voted openly, Sir Thomas Maitland having, by his own authority, abolished the ballot.

The Assembly met on the 23rd of April, 1817, in the palace of the Lord High Commissioner, then situated in the citadel. His Excellency made them a characteristic speech. He proposed that the Primary Council should constitute itself into a committee of the Assembly, and lay before it in

* This idea of the double list was not original in Sir Thomas Maitland. An Ionian, acting as the Russian Plenipotentiary in 1803, had been the first to carry out the measure in question. *Vide* page 65 of the Introduction.

due form the constitutional charter. He promised to assist the Assembly personally in its labours, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Paris. And, finally, he congratulated them on the fact that the day of their meeting was the festival of St. George, the patron saint of England, who was also honored in the Islands, though on a different date.

The President replied immediately by a flattering speech. Two days later, on the 25th of April, the Baron Theotoky addressed the Assembly on the subject of the opening speech of the Lord High Commissioner. He declared that ever since Providence had brought to these Islands "that incomparable man" (as he styled Sir Thomas Maitland), he had been busily employed in planning their welfare. He painted a glowing picture of the benefits about to be derived from his sway. The restoration of internal peace and security, the inviolability of property, the cessation of class dissensions, the equal distribution of justice, the diminution of imposts, were all liberally promised. Finally, the Baron announced "the production of a constitutional charter, which would be a perpetual guarantee to them of that independence which the Treaty of Paris had bequeathed to them as an honorable patrimony."

After this bold beginning, the Baron gave them a sketch of the intended constitution. The executive was to be vested, under the Lord High Commis-

sioner, in a Senate with a President, a Greek, who was to have the title of Highness. Each of the four larger islands was to furnish one member to the Senate, that is, to the Government. The three smaller islands were in succession to furnish one member. The Senate, besides being the executive, had certain legislative functions. Its consent, as well as that of the Lord High Commissioner, was required to any bills to be passed by the Assembly. The latter was to hold the purse-strings of the State, and the civil list was to be annually fixed. The Parliament was to nominate the Senate under certain conditions, and the Senate was to name the judges and the heads of administration in all the Islands. The municipalities were to be elected by the people. The Greek religion and the Greek language were to be placed above the religion and language of the protecting State. Lastly, their benevolent protector would not burden them with the expense of the troops. Baron Theotoky then very sensibly and logically told them, that the name of independence, in an absolute sense, could not be applied to a nation which could neither defend itself, nor make peace and war with other powers. He recommended them to be contented with the limited independence which the protecting power was willing to accord to them.

Of all the promises held out in this speech, that of not burdening the Islands with the cost of the troops and garrisons, was, as far as regards the

powers of the Assembly, the only one fulfilled by Sir Thomas Maitland's constitution.* The veto of his Excellency was of universal application; and in its effects, when he chose to exercise it, it made him absolutely despotic. As the constitution of 1817 underwent some modification in 1850, it will not be necessary here to give all its details. A few specimens of its provisions will show the tenor of the whole, and establish the complete autocracy of the Lord High Commissioner. The Legislative Assembly, as has been already shown, were the nominees of the Primary Council, themselves the nominees of the Commissioner. This packed Assembly elected the senators. But his Excellency could use his veto against any senator. In that case, the Assembly elected again; but the Lord High Commissioner could again employ his veto. After the second veto, his Excellency was empowered to send two names to the Assembly, which was compelled to elect one of them. But a packed Parliament was not likely to give much trouble. The King in Council could alone dissolve the Assembly before the expiration of its regular term of five years.

The President of the Senate was nominally the head of the State. He was appointed by the King of England, and he had a double vote in the Senate.

* Count Capodistrias made repeated protests against the constitution of 1817 as directly contrary to the Treaty of Paris. But his representations had no effect either with Sir Thomas Maitland or with the Ministers of England. He was looked upon as the strong partisan of Russia, in whose diplomatic service he had been so long employed.

He was styled his Highness the President, and the constitution decreed to him the same honors as to the Lord High Commissioner. But he owed his appointment to the King's representative, whose recommendation was decisive. Nor was that all. Whilst the other senators were appointed for five years, the President of the Senate was appointed only for two years and a half. At the end of that period, the Lord High Commissioner could either renew his appointment, or name a new president. This rule has never been modified. It is, therefore, needless to say that the Presidents of the Senate have ever been only the first and confidential servants of the Lord High Commissioner. The Senate, when the Assembly was not sitting, had the power of making provisional laws, *and of carrying on the expenditure till a new budget was voted.*

The appointment of the President of the Assembly was scarcely less important than that of President of the Senate; for though nominally elected by the members of the Assembly, he was equally, by the double veto of his Excellency, a servant of the Government.

The same perpetual negation acted similarly as regards the regents of the Islands, nominally appointed by the Senate. And means were taken to make the municipalities, nominally elected by the people, equally the nominees of the Government. Moreover, the presidents, whose ostensible duties were only to observe and check the local govern-

ments, really governed the subordinate islands in the time of Sir Thomas Maitland, subject only to the orders of the Lord High Commissioner. The appointments of the judges also, nominally made by the Senate, were likewise in the hands of his Excellency. The constitution, however, made a certain difference between the appointments of regents and that of judges. Regents were to vacate their appointments at the end of their five years of office, but the judges were to continue in the exercise of their functions till they were either reappointed or replaced. This difference was, doubtless, meant as a homage to the maxim, that judges should always be immovable, except for misconduct or inefficiency. In the opinion of Sir Thomas Maitland, the corrupt venality of the tribunals in the time of Venice, had left sufficient traces in the morals of the inhabitants to render it impossible to trust entirely to the virtue of Ionian judges.* But while reserving to himself the power of punishing corrupt or unjust judges by deprivation of office, he yet marked his approval of the general principle of the independence of judges, by holding out the prospect of reappointment to such as did their duty.

The Supreme Council of Corfu remained to the last as appointed by Sir Thomas Maitland. It was

* Count Capodistrias was of the same opinion. In his memorandum of 1815, to Lord Castlereagh, he wrote, alluding to the administration of justice in the Ionian Islands, "Elle est encore eveloppée des ténèbres dont la couvrait la malice et la corruption Vénitienne."

composed of two English and of two Ionian judges. Each of the four by turns annually acted as chief justice. The two Ionians were subject to the same laws of appointment as the inferior judges, but their high position and character usually made their reappointment, at the end of each quinquennium, a mere matter of course.* The Lord High Commissioner and the President of the Senate were made extraordinary members of the Supreme Court; and, as the numbers were thus made even, his Excellency was given a double vote.

By the constitution the powers of the high police were placed in the hands of the Lord High Commissioner and the Commander of the Forces. Practically this power has been exercised solely by the former. Had the Islands, whilst under British protection, been involved in war, the authority of the Commander of the Forces over the police would, doubtless, have come into play. But that simple provision of the constitution (certainly not contemplated by the Treaty of Paris) has always been interpreted to give to the representative of British protection full powers, in cases of emergency, of which he is to be sole judge, to banish to some rock, or out of the Islands altogether, any man he pleased, no matter what his rank or position. During the first thirty years of the Protec-

* The ancient Persians, mentioned by Herodotus, recognized the necessity of securing the independence of judges. "The royal judges are men chosen from among Persians, who continue in office *until they die or are convicted of some injustice.*"—Cary's *Herodotus.*

torate this power was frequently exerted by the Lord High Commissioners and their Residents in the most despotic and arbitrary manner. Cerigotto especially, a barren rock, inhabited by a few fishermen, was the favourite place of arbitrary banishment. The representatives of the Protectorate, almost without exception, have made use of the high police powers, which the first Lord High Commissioner appears to have assumed entirely of his own authority.

The constitution of 1817 held out to the Ionians the hopes of a boon which they greatly prized. It was decreed that Greek should be the future language of the law and of the Government, and that when the use of the Italian had ceased, English should be the only other language officially employed. But, in spite of this promise, Italian continued for more than thirty years to be the official and legal language of the Islands.

If it be impossible for an impartial writer to commend the manner in which Sir Thomas Maitland interpreted and carried out the provisions of the Treaty of Paris, let justice still be done to his memory. That he established an artful, but complete, despotism cannot be denied. Nevertheless, the general tenor of his rule merits high commendation. In judging of his conduct, the enormous difficulties of his task and position must be duly weighed. This can only be done by persons thoroughly acquainted with the past history of the

Ionian Islands, and the terrible ordeals of repeated bad Governments to which they have been subjected for ages. At what period have the Ionians ever been happy, contented, and prosperous? If not under the English Protectorate, assuredly the question cannot be answered. A people who cannot answer such a question is certainly deserving of compassion; but, by their silence, they confess the difficulty of governing them.

Let us impartially consider the measures adopted by Sir Thomas Maitland. He did not interfere greatly with the state of franchise, then the privilege of a few, chiefly, if not entirely, nobles; because it was not his intention to begin by giving the people full freedom of voting. He believed a despotism necessary for their good, as it doubtless was agreeable to his own inclinations. But no Ionian who has any regard for truth has ever denied the many and great benefits of his rule. To mention them all in detail would weary the reader, but a few are worthy of notice, and will suffice to prove the case. He broke the entail of fiefs, thus facilitating the sale of estates, and lessening the influence of the nobles. He forbade usurious advances from landlord to tenants, and thus liberated the peasantry from a miserable bondage to the landlords.* He abolished, also, the monopoly in oil, established by the grasping Government of Venice. He built bridges, and began the

* Jervis, Bowen, Napier.

construction of those excellent roads, which, in a Greek country, strike all intelligent travellers with surprise and admiration.* He, moreover, abolished the direct taxes, raising the revenue chiefly on exports and imports; though he erred in raising to nearly twenty per cent. the duty on currants. Commerce increased under his rule; but this was, undoubtedly, partly owing to circumstances not under his control, such as the destruction of currants in the Morea, which raised the value of the island currants. He abolished the corrupt system of farming the Church lands by individuals, and increased the revenue by transferring their management to Government. He also suppressed all disorders, and comparatively put an end to the once frequent (and in some islands almost daily) assassinations. By means of his excellent police life and property became almost as secure as in the most civilized countries. Above all, he enforced with a resolute hand the impartial distribution of justice. He instructed, encouraged, and supported his Residents in the subordinate islands in carrying out measures of beneficence and justice similar to his own. Assuredly, the Ionian Islands prospered under his sway. He has, however, been frequently condemned for creating too many Government offices, with salaries on a scale unprecedented for so poor a country. With regard to

* Vide the travels of the American, Mr. Taylor, and those of the Frenchmen, Messrs. Lacour, About, and Grenier. I say nothing of the dozens of English travellers who have written to the same effect.

60494

the numerous posts, these were not made merely to increase his influence. He wished, with wise prescience, to mitigate an evil which, more than any other, has made the British Protectorate unpopular with the Ionians. The great complaint of the educated youth under English rule has ever been the want of a profession. They had before them no military, or naval, or diplomatic, or clerical career, such as British youths can aspire to obtain. The English occupied the first three, and few educated Greeks will enter the Church. Moreover, there was no opening for commercial pursuits. Thus, the idleness of which the Ionians have been accused was, in a great measure, less their fault than their misfortune.

In augmenting the salaries, the object of Sir Thomas was to put a stop to the once universal prevalence of bribery and corruption under the small salaries of the Venetian system. But he carried his remedy to very extravagant lengths.* His successors greatly reduced these employments in number and salary, with the result only of increased discontent amongst the rising generation, who could not all be advocates and doctors—the only careers open to the Ionian youth. Thus, the active, industrious, and ambitious, who were reduced to idleness and despair, were tempted to

* One case will serve as a sample. The President of the Senate, in the time of the Russian Protectorate, was allowed 1515 dollars yearly, Sir Thomas Maitland fixed the salary of the fortunate Baron Theotoky at 6222 ditto.

become political demagogues and unscrupulous flatterers of the mob.*

With regard to the expenses of maintaining a large and highly-paid Government establishment, Sir Thomas Maitland was enabled to meet them easily, by omitting to propose the convention regarding the charges for the forts and garrisons, which he was authorized to make with the Legislature. His heavy civil list made, indeed, such a convention impossible.

The unpopularity which almost invariably attends despotic rule was enhanced, in the case of the first Lord High Commissioner, by external political events. Parga was still considered by the Ionians as a dependency of Corfu; and they were very indignant to find that, by the arrangements of the Congress of Vienna, it was to be ceded to Turkey, in virtue of a previous treaty. As the inhabitants of Parga were determined not to become the subjects of Turkey, they had to abandon their property, as well as their country, and to take refuge in the Ionian Islands. The compensation of nearly 150,000*l.*, agreed to between the Lord High Commissioner and the Turkish Government, was considered insufficient. The Lord High Commissioner was also blamed for the

* Not only France and Russia, but even Venice (as has been shown in the Introduction), opened to the Ionian youths careers in arms and diplomacy, which have been almost entirely closed to them under the Protectorate of Great Britain.

surrender of Parga itself, with which event he had nothing to do, except to obey orders.

The discontent, caused partly by the complete denial of effective political rights, and partly by that restlessness and impatience of foreign rule common to all Greeks, manifested itself on several occasions. In October, 1819, riots occurred at Santa Maura, where the people refused to pay the taxes for the canal. Troops arrived from Corfu, as a reinforcement of the military detachment; and Sir Frederick Stovin, the Resident, speedily restored order, but not without bloodshed.*

The Greek War of Independence gave especial trouble to the English local Government. This event naturally occasioned the greatest excitement in the Ionian Islands. The Cephalonians, especially, took up the cause with enthusiasm; many of them proceeding to Greece, to take part in a movement fraught, as they fondly hoped, with the future regeneration of the whole Greek race.

The sympathy with the revolution extended to England, where Lord Byron and other persons of distinction formed an association for the liberation of Greece. But the British Government of the day regarded the outbreak with a very unfavourable eye, from a jealousy of Russia; which was believed

* Jervis. In 1821 a petition circulated in Zante, the object of which was to limit the power of the Lord High Commissioner. The matter was speedily suppressed; and the obsequious Assembly, by a resolution of the 8th of May, suspended Count Anastatius Flamburiari from his office of member of Parliament, for having signed the same petition.

to have excited the revolt from Turkey for her own selfish purposes. The Lord High Commissioner proclaimed a strict neutrality, under severe penalties. But his Excellency's subsequent acts justified the suspicion that he was strongly inclined to favour the Turks; and the indignation of the Ionians knew no bounds. Many of them, in spite of prohibitory laws, left their country and took an active and distinguished part in the War of Independence.

In 1821, Kolokotrones (who in 1806 had taken refuge in the Ionian Islands) left Zante to join the outbreak on the continent, in which he was destined to take so prominent a part. In the same year the Patriarch Gregorius was executed at Constantinople, and his body abandoned to the Jews (those victims and enemies of the Greek race), and treated with the greatest indignities. The crime of the Patriarch was his participation in the schemes of the Hetairists, that is, of the Greek race generally.* In Zante there were outbreaks excited by the priests, in consequence of the sequestration of Church property for the use of Government. A Turkish brig of war was driven on shore at Zante in 1821, and attacked by the inhabitants. The English soldiers who were sent to escort the Turks to the lazaretto, were fired upon; a few were killed, and their officer was wounded. In consequence, martial law was proclaimed at Zante; the ring-

* Finlay's *History of Greece*. Jervis.

leaders of the revolt were executed, and the peasantry were afterwards disarmed.*

Cerigo was the same year the scene of a most horrible outrage upon some Turks, chiefly women, who had taken refuge in the island, and who were all massacred after undergoing the most disgraceful treatment. Here again the detachment of soldiers was attacked, and one of them killed; for this outrage five Cerigots were tried, condemned, and executed.†

A.D. 1822-3.—The firmness and ability of the Resident, Colonel (afterwards Sir Charles) Napier, kept Cephalonia comparatively tranquil. His popularity was augmented by the knowledge on the part of the inhabitants, that although he was obliged to enforce the neutrality, he yet sympathized with the Greek cause. Lord Byron arrived in the island on the 11th of December, 1823, and stayed there some months before proceeding to Greece, to close his romantic career at Missolonghi. Colonel Napier, as is well known, would gladly have held a command in the Greek army, had the Government been willing to grant him the necessary permission. He was for nine years Resident of Cephalonia, and he established a reputation as a ruler and benefactor far superior to that of any other Englishman who has ever been employed in the Islands throughout the English Protectorate. But under Sir Thomas Maitland he was

* Finlay. † Jervis.

only commencing his career of energy and usefulness.

Colonel Stovin and Lord Charles Fitzroy, the Residents of Santa Maura and of Zante, also did honor to their appointments, though they could not be compared to Napier. Lord Charles Fitzroy conferred a signal benefit on the town of Zante, by supplying it plentifully with water by means of an aqueduct; the inhabitants having hitherto depended entirely upon tanks for the use of that indispensable article. Those only who have lived in hot climates can fully appreciate the value of such a boon.

The financial measures adopted by the first Lord High Commissioner were, generally speaking, eminently successful. His expenditure was always considerably below his income, and at his death, after eight years of administration, he left behind him a total surplus of about 130,000*l.*,* having originally found in the treasury only a few pence.

On the 17th of January, 1824, Sir Thomas Maitland died of apoplexy at Malta, of which fortress he was governor. It is by no means easy to form a very exact idea of the estimation in which he was generally held by the Ionians. If the nobles were offended by his attacks on the abuses committed by them as landlords, and as feudal chiefs, they, on the

* 156,520*l.* in the statistics of an Ionian writer. Captain Jervis states the sum at 600,000 dollars. Colonel Napier, nearer the time, calls it 130,000*l.*, as in the text, which about equals 600,000 dollars.

other hand, had reason to be gratified by his not extending the franchise, and also by his rendering their lives and property comparatively secure. By the nobles, also, the offices were chiefly held under his rule. The owners of property became, in fact, eventually the chief friends of the British Protectorate, and so continued to the very last. Neither was it possible for the peasantry to regard Sir Thomas Maitland in any other than a favourable light, except in so far as the influence of the priesthood and the cherished ideas of nationality were concerned; for to the peasantry Sir Thomas was a great and undoubted benefactor. But his constitution gave them not the slightest power of expressing their opinions, and in after years, when the benefits which had been received were forgotten, their ignorance made them, on being suddenly emancipated, an easy prey to the demagogues. These always represented the British Government as the sole cause of all the evils, which are everywhere inseparable from the accidents of nature and of life.

Impartial persons must acknowledge that Sir Thomas Maitland was not justified in making himself, without any true consent on the part of the Ionians, a completely despotic ruler, under the transparent form of a pretended constitutional government. Yet it is not evident that he could in any other manner have conferred on them the many material benefits

which distinguished his government. It is also generally allowed that the scheme which he adopted became an excellent school for the political education of the people. But it must be owned that Great Britain, as the model free government of Europe, was placed in a false position by the constitution of 1817, which no honest man could pretend to be strictly in accordance with the Treaty of Paris. A taint of injustice and of tyranny thenceforth adhered to the Protectorate of Great Britain, which was, as far as regarded the Ionians, destined to counterbalance much of the effects of an enlightened distribution of many substantial benefits. Sir Thomas Maitland, however, believed that the Islands were for ever practically annexed to Great Britain, and that his main business was to secure by skilful measures that military possession which was unsupported by the natural props of nationality, customs, and religion.

It was evident to him after the Greek revolution, that the political liberty of the Ionians would be incompatible with the interests, as he understood them, of the Protectorate. So that he was even less inclined at the close of his career than he had been at the beginning, to grant liberal measures to the Islanders. It must be also remembered, that attaching a great importance to the possession of Corfu, Sir Thomas Maitland, in common with the rest of the world, never contemplated that a period would arrive when Great Britain would voluntarily

cede to another power one of the strongest naval and military posts in the world. Strict justice was therefore sacrificed to political expediency.

After his death, a circular temple of small dimensions was raised in his honor in the south of the Esplanade at Corfu, a memorial which he deservedly merited, from the substantial benefits conferred by his rule. The parade-ground at Cephalonia is likewise ornamented by a statue of Sir Thomas Maitland, the only statue existing in that island. It stands on a piece of natural rock, but is not a work of any merit. On the contrary, it is a striking example of the degenerate state of art in modern Greece.

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL SIR FREDERICK ADAM, SECOND LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1824 TO 1832.]

Sir Frederick Adam's Policy—Supplies Corfu with Water—His Conduct to Colonel Napier—Napier in Cephalonia—His Mode of giving Satisfaction—Sir F. Adam's Residents—Difficult Position of the Protectorate—Sir Frederick's love of Pomp—His Extravagance—His Police—High Police used by Napier—Unjust Judges—Napier's sole Failure—Sir F. Adam Master of the Senate—His Finances—Present and Statue—Supports the Aristocracy—The Ionian Nobles.

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR FREDERICK ADAM was appointed to succeed Sir Thomas Maitland. He had been for some years second in command of the troops, and in the occasional absence of his chief at his government of Malta, Sir Frederick had had temporary charge of the civil government of the Islands. Whilst his position had been one of comparatively little responsibility, he had associated on intimate terms with the intelligent and agreeable nobles of Corfu. This circumstance is said to have affected his conduct as Lord High Commissioner, and to have thrown him into the hands of the

feudal party. For this he has been condemned by some writers,* but although his predecessor had done good service in putting down feudalism, as well as the tyranny exercised over the peasantry, still it may be doubted whether it was a wise act entirely to destroy the influence of the nobles. For in a constitutional monarchy it has ever been found necessary to have an influential nobility between the king and the people, to guard against the extremes both of democracy and of despotism. But whether on public or on private grounds, or from a mixture of both, it is certain that the second Lord High Commissioner favoured the aristocracy, by whom, consequently, he has ever been deemed the best and most popular of the English rulers. In his general policy, however, he imitated Sir Thomas Maitland, carrying on the improvements commenced by the latter, and originating others himself. Good roads were made in Corfu, in Zante, and also in Cephalonia.† In the last named island, however, the chief credit of these, and other public works, was due to the Resident, Colonel Napier, who for some time was cordially supported by the Lord High Commissioner. The formation of good roads is a matter of great importance ; for it has ever been found to be one of the most efficient and speedy means for civilizing a country, and for ensuring its order and prosperity. Sir Frederick Adam supported schools also, and

* Napier, Jervis.

† Baron Theotoky.—*Détails sur Corfou.*

increased their number; but the greatest benefit conferred by him on the Corfiots, was undoubtedly the supplying of the capital with abundant water. Like the Ionian Islands generally, Corfu had been notorious for ages for the scarcity of fresh water. As early as the year 1352, Boccaccio, in his novel of "Landolfo Buffolo," notices this fact; for he describes a Corfiot woman as employed in cleaning "her kitchen utensils with sand and *salt water*."*

A.D. 1824.—When Sir Frederick Adam began his rule, water was brought into Corfu by carriers from Potamo, three miles off; and was sold as regularly as the produce of the gardens, or of the fields. The success of Lord Charles Fitzroy, the Resident of Zante, in supplying that town with water, was an example that demanded imitation in Corfu. But in Zante the task was comparatively easy, fresh springs being situated close to the town. In Corfu it was far otherwise, for there the water had to be conveyed from a great distance. From the springs of San Nicolo, on the heights above the village of Benitza, four hundred feet above the level of the sea, clear and beautiful water flows. One of these springs was selected to supply Corfu. The distance is about seven miles. The formation of the aqueduct was an undertaking of great difficulty and expense. It is said to

* "Rudolfo . . . . pervenne al lito dell' Isola di *Gurfo*, dove una povera feminetta, per ventura suoi stovigli con la rena, e con *l'acqua salsa* lavava e faceva belli."

have cost thirty thousand pounds.* It was accomplished in 1831, and was a work of which the Lord High Commissioner might be justly proud.

In imitation of Sir Thomas Maitland, Sir Frederick Adam would not grant any freedom to the press; nor permit any journal to be published, with the exception of the Government *Gazette*, in Corfu. Colonel Napier, the able Resident of Cephalonia, endeavoured to obtain permission for Captain Kennedy, his secretary, to establish a lithographic press, for the convenience of the local Government. But Sir Frederick Adam was horrified at such an idea, which was therefore abandoned.† Although his Excellency had at first acknowledged the great services of his Resident, yet, after a few years, he became very jealous of him, and of the well-merited fame which he had acquired. He therefore commenced against him a series of petty annoyances;‡ whilst his support of his measures grew every day colder. Colonel Napier had conferred countless benefits, both material and moral, on the Cephalonians. Roads, skilfully constructed, were opened in every direction. Good schools were established. Unjust judges were detected and

* Dr. Davy's *Ionian Islands.* † Napier.

‡ Amongst other things, Sir Frederick Adam ordered Colonel Napier, then at the head of the civil as well as military government of Cephalonia, to *shave off his mustachios*, which it was not the regulation for infantry officers then to wear.

punished; whilst the good were encouraged and supported. Feudalism was suppressed with vigour; and the peasantry were protected from the tyranny, and from the usurious capacity of the landlords. Finally, life and property attained to a security hitherto unknown in the island.

To fit himself, moreover, for the post of Resident, Colonel Napier not only learnt Italian, but even acquired a knowledge of modern Greek. Copies of letters written by him in both languages were found in his official books. The towns of Argostoli and Lixuri, to this day, are monuments of his skill, and of his indomitable energy and activity. The moles, court-houses, markets, in both towns, are amongst the fruits of his exertions. To repeat the old classic saying, the stranger has but to look around, if he desire to see countless monuments of the famous Resident. The Cephalonians have felt it needless to raise to his memory any particular testimonial. No man, however, can make such great changes as Colonel Napier did, without causing, for the time at least, great hostility. After nine years of a meritorious rule, advantage was taken of his absence on leave in England to remove him from his Residency, in consequence of a petition got up by a disreputable minority; many of whom had only too good reason for dreading the activity and honesty of the English ruler.

It must, however, be confessed, in justice to Sir

Frederick Adam, that there were some faults on the other side also. The Napiers were notoriously always more fitted to command than to obey, and, though generous and indulgent as chiefs, they often proved themselves disobedient and unruly as subordinates. Moreover, Colonel Napier undoubtedly indulged at times at Cephalonia in acts of arbitrary violence, which, however much they may be palliated under the circumstances, cannot be gravely defended. On one occasion, hearing screams, and learning that a titled Ionian was beating his wife, he rushed into the house, and inflicted on the spot, with his riding-whip, a severe personal chastisement on the astonished husband. To be sure, he immediately afterwards sent to offer to the sufferer complete personal satisfaction. But the Ionian, ignorant of Western refinements in such matters, and unused to the pistol, refused to understand how the being shot at could fully atone for the disgrace of having been flogged.

On other occasions, when his very excellent roads were being made by compulsory labour, Colonel Napier would jump off his horse, and by the energetic use of his whip infuse unwonted activity into the idle labourers. But notwithstanding these and other minor defects, the name of Napier will always stand out unrivalled among the list of Englishmen who have figured in the Ionian Islands. Therefore, the disgrace of having dis-

missed such a man from office detracts considerably from the fame of Sir Frederick Adam.

The firmness and justice of Napier had preserved quiet in the early days of the Protectorate amongst the restless Cephalonians, who gave so much trouble to many of his successors.* From his departure may be dated the death-blow to the salutary position of Residents in the Islands. By the constitution of 1817, they were entitled to the same honours as the Lord High Commissioner. But Sir Frederick Adam, partly from a feeling of jealousy, and partly in deference to the aristocratic party, laboured to nullify the position and duties of the office. The Residents, therefore, soon became men of little influence in the Islands, where, as the representatives of the Lord High Commissioners, they still held the first rank, and were supposed to be the chief rulers. The Commissioners themselves paid rare visits, and only for a few days, to the out-stations, so that after a time England could be said to be properly represented only in Corfu; the rulers of which attempted to manage the details of all the Islands. But as they were unequal to the task, the rein was given to local intrigues and injustices, and the British

* On the 22nd of April, 1829, he wrote to Sir F. Adam: "My reasons for feeling secure are these. Our government is just. Whatever its errors may be, they are not intentional. . . . . All our great proprietors of currants are glued to the English market; the peasant and noble hate each other, so that conspiracy cannot exist; intrigue may, and does, but it can do nothing against bayonets. After all, Cephalonia is your weak point."

Government fell into contempt. It was even suspected at times of approving of the local anarchy.* The small salaries of the Residents not permitting them to show much hospitality, contributed to their greater isolation, and uselessness in the Islands. The result was that the Government became Greek without being national. The false position of England, with reference to the Treaty of Paris, could be condoned only by practical benefits, resulting from the actual rule of Englishmen. If this were unnecessary, and if the Greeks were quite fit to govern themselves, then in common honesty such a reform became necessary as should make the Ionian Government responsible to the nation; instead of being alternately the tool, or the deceiver, of the despotic British Commissioners.†

But such a reform, since the temper of the Ionians had been shown during the Greek revolution, could lead only to a constant demand for union with Greece. In short, if England were resolved to keep the Islands, and at the same time to enforce good government, the only plan was that of Sir Thomas Maitland; namely, to rule &c.

* Of course this suspicion was absurd; but knowing the irresistible power of England, the people in the subordinate islands naturally held the English Government responsible for all the evils that it did not prevent.

† It is no disproof of despotism in Lord High Commissioners, that they have sometimes been the tools of others. The same may be said of many despotic kings and emperors in history, who were not thereby acquitted of the responsibility which attaches to all despotic authority.

tively through the Lord High Commissioner and his Residents. The only wise alternative was to consent to the Union, as has been finally done in 1863.

To Sir Frederick Adam has been attributed the fault, that the magnificent schemes of education, for which the Earl of Guildford sacrificed so much time and money, led to no permanent beneficial result. But neither in number, civilization, nor wealth, were the Islands at that time suited for the establishment of such an university as that contemplated by the philanthropic, but eccentric, British peer.* Moreover, Sir Frederick could not be expected after Lord Guildford's death to accept a legacy which would tie down the Government to an expensive and doubtful undertaking. On a small scale, however, the latter carried on the plan at its own expense. The efforts of the Lord High Commissioner to establish colleges and schools have failed of complete success; chiefly through jealousy of English interference, and from the effects of religious prejudices. The young Ionians have always preferred being educated in France, or Italy, or latterly at Athens, to attending the local schools and universities.

Sir Frederick Adam was unfortunately too fond of pomp and display. It appears that he contemplated having a guard of lancers in Corfu, for

* Davy, Jervis.

which he was justly ridiculed by Colonel Napier. But I cannot learn that he ever carried his design into effect. Sir Thomas Maitland, finding the old palace in the citadel too small, had built a large and handsome palace to the north of the Esplanade. Sir Frederick, not contented with this, built another house of considerable dimensions, and called it the Casino. It was meant for a country house; but as it is but a little more than a mile from the town, it is useless in that capacity, and has rarely been occupied by the Commissioners themselves. The expense of this third palace was estimated at 20,000*l.**

Sir Frederick Adam was the first to carry out the convention named in the Treaty of Paris, with which Sir Thomas Maitland had wisely dispensed. In seven years, it was calculated that 154,000*l.* were spent on the fortifications of Corfu.† Liberty throve as little under the second as it had done under the first Lord High Commissioner, though the nobles had now more influence. As the Primary Council with its double lists packed the Assembly, and as the ballot had been abolished by the British Protectorate, even the small constituencies did not all use their votes. Colonel Napier calculated the electors in Cephalonia at about 600 in his

* Napier. Subsequently the old palace in the citadel was converted into the house of the Commander of the Forces, leaving two palaces for the Commissioner.

† Ibid.

time; but, he added, that 320 were the most who had ever voted since the abolition of the ballot. He also pronounced the system of police to be more harassing than that of Austria, with far less excuse for its severity.

Sir Frederick Adam checked the road-making labours of Colonel Napier, by abolishing throughout the Islands the system of *corvées*, or forced labour; and he substituted, as regarded Cephalonia, a tax for the importation of cattle, without taking the trouble of inquiring from his Resident the quantity of cattle imported. Long afterwards his Excellency learned that scarcely any cattle were ever sent to that island.

The poor peasants were still tried in the Italian language, which they could not understand, to the detriment of justice and of equity. This great evil was not destined to be entirely remedied for many years.

The arbitrary high police powers were occasionally used by all the Lord High Commissioners. Early in 1829, Colonel Napier himself made use of them, to punish the destruction by goats of valuable trees in the Black Forest of Cephalonia. The goats were seized, but the owners assaulted the constable with stones, and wounded him on the head. Napier knew that it was useless to send the case to the tribunals, on account of the wholesale perjury, which was then habitual. He therefore himself

sentenced six of the offenders to a month's imprisonment in jail with irons; whilst he confiscated one-third of their goats; all of which was approved by Sir Frederick Adam.

The Lord High Commissioner, it may be presumed, from the following specimen of his conduct, was not eager either to discover or to punish unjust judges. Colonel Napier detected some glaringly disgraceful acts in which two Cephalonian judges were concerned. He had reason to believe that this was not a solitary case, but that private persons dared not come forward to accuse any judge. He immediately suspended the culprits from their offices. But the Regent of Cephalonia, from friendship to the parties, or from timidity, did not support the conduct of the Resident. He stated that he feared that the friends of the culprits at Corfu were too powerful not to defend them well; so that it would be useless to attempt to punish them. These offenders were eventually removed by Sir F. Adam; but they were not disgraced, nor prevented from again serving the Government.*

It must be confessed, however, that Ionian judges, with the example of four centuries of corruption under the rule of Venice, and surrounded by the influence and importunities of friends, have a most difficult position to maintain, and must not be regarded like judges in England. For the latter are

* Napier Correspondence.

but little tempted to deviate from the paths of rectitude; and were they to do so, they would incur a social contempt more terrible than even the penalties of the law.*

In consequence of the soil in most of the Islands being chiefly dedicated to the cultivation of currants and olives, the corn produced was never more than sufficient for one-third of the annual consumption of the inhabitants. Great inconvenience occasionally arose from its scarcity, which, in the event of war, would have been felt as a cause of weakness and embarrassment. It was necessary always to import corn from Russia, and other foreign countries. In 1828, these supplies having been insufficient, the Government of Cephalonia were obliged to apply to Corfu for a large supply of corn.†

During the rule of Sir Frederick Adam, a Maltese colony was introduced into Cephalonia by Colonel Napier, with the intention of cultivating certain lands, and of setting an example of skill and industry to the Greeks. The colony was settled at Pronos, to the south-east of the island; but it was, eventually, a decided failure. The jealousy of the Greeks, and the discontent of the Maltese themselves, together with the great expense of carrying out the plan, all combined to render the enterprise

* In 1823, Colonel Napier wrote: "A good judge in Cephalonia is a greater man than a good judge in England or France. It is therefore very difficult to find such a character." In 1863 there is no such difficulty, so much is justice improved under the British Protectorate.

† Napier Correspondence.

abortive. But this solitary miscarriage only served to render more conspicuous the general success of the Resident's administration. Had Colonel Napier been Lord High Commissioner, there can be no doubt that the Islands would have attained to a high degree of prosperity and civilization under his energetic and beneficent rule.

Sir Frederick Adam, under the constitution of 1817, was (to use the words of Sir Charles Napier) "the perfect master of the Senate."* He had also won their good will by conceding to them some share of power and influence. The Senate, therefore, at his departure, voted him a statue, and also 2000*l.* for a diamond star, out of the impoverished treasury.

The average revenue of Sir Thomas Maitland appears to have somewhat exceeded 100,000*l.* a year; whilst his average annual expenditure was about 87,000*l.* Sir Frederick Adam had a revenue of 140,000*l.* a year, and not only spent it, but, in addition, he spent the 130,000*l.* left in the treasury by Sir Thomas Maitland. In times of peace, such as have prevailed throughout the period of the British Protectorate, some excuse is required for not keeping the expenditure within the income. But it appears that if the great cost of the aque-

* Napier's Correspondence. That supremacy of the Lord High Commissioner over the Senate was not lessened, but rather increased, by the reforms of 1848, which gave to the Commissioner the direct instead of the indirect nomination of the senators.

duct from Benitza to Corfu be considered, and also the great increase of schools (and on no better objects could the surplus of Sir Thomas Maitland have been spent), then the expenditure of Sir Frederick Adam did not greatly exceed his revenue. He, moreover, necessarily increased the taxes, as, without diminishing his civil list, he made in 1828 with his Legislature the convention ordered by the Treaty of Paris with regard to the payment of the forts and garrisons.* He can, therefore, only be blamed for not having endeavoured, like his predecessor, to have a surplus for future improvements and emergencies. But, unlike most of his successors, he left, at all events, no actual debts; although he introduced many material improvements.

It would certainly have been better if he had not accepted any present from his friends, the Senate. Even the Venetians punished their proveditors when detected in receiving presents, though the detection appears to have been a rare circumstance, owing to general connivance. The statue, which was raised after the departure of the Lord High Commissioner in front of the palace, was of less importance, though statues were also amongst the things forbidden under the Venetian system. An Englishman should at least remember

* Napier states the sum for fortifications alone as averaging in his time 23,000*l.* a year. A parliamentary return gives the average of annual total payments for military protection from 1818 to 1849 as amounting to 26,000*l.*

that it is only from a really free people that presents and compliments can be with honor received. With regard to the partiality shown by Sir Frederick Adam to the aristocracy, something may fairly be said in his favour. He probably considered that in sharing his boundless authority with the nobles, he was making an advance from the illiberality of his predecessor, who had retained all power in his own hands. He might also honestly be of opinion that an aristocratic element was an advantage amongst the naturally democratic Greeks, when once the abuses and vices of the Venetian system had been removed. The pleasing manners and natural intelligence of the Ionian gentry, as soon as their coldness to foreigners is overcome, always exercised an irresistible influence; and Sir Frederick had felt its effects before he became Lord High Commissioner. As to the love of office, considering the few openings, not of a political nature, for the active employment of young Ionians, this vice is not more powerful in the Islands than it is in England, though proportionably more prominent. Even in England, if a person have interest enough to hold a public employment and does not strive to obtain one, his conduct (as a general rule) can arise only from his having independent means, or other more favourable prospects in view. With regard, finally, to the tendency to nepotism amongst the Ionian gentry in office, this is a matter upon which, as an

Englishman, I must decline to be the first to take up a stone. It is true, fortunately, that the mass of my countrymen have not the temptation, nor the inducement, to look up to office as the great object of life. But amongst those who seek such employments, it is well known that in England also success greatly depends on political and family influence.

The absence of an aristocracy is, assuredly, a great defect in a constitutional kingdom. It is owing, I sincerely believe, to the utter absence of any permanent check on an unruly democracy that continental Greece has ever fluctuated (since its revolt from Turkey) between popular anarchy and autocratic tyranny. And it is probable that one of the chief advantages that Greece will gain by the union of the Islands, is that leaven of refinement and of civilization which the Ionian gentry will import into Greece; improved as they have been by long training under constitutional England.

With all his faults, his love of pomp, his jealousy, and other weaknesses, Sir Frederick Adam was, nevertheless, an Englishman of ability and energy, whose government of the Islands was not, on the whole, discreditable to England; although it was tarnished by the injustice with which, as has been recorded, he treated one of the greatest of his countrymen.

Doubtless, Sir Frederick, like his predecessor, be-

lieved that Great Britain had for ever taken possession of the fortress of Corfu; and if so, his support of that party which by its property and intelligence was inclined to maintain the British Protectorate, was only the natural conduct of a Conservative English gentleman. Conservatism and Protection were destined soon to carry on a long battle with Democracy, and the demands for union with Greece. The former have at last, in 1863, been finally defeated by the cession of the Islands to Greece, which fact will probably be generally regarded as the virtual condemnation of the policy of the great majority of the Lord High Commissioners.

Sir Frederick Adam took his departure from the Islands in 1832, and was succeeded by Lord Nugent

CHAPTER III.

LORD NUGENT, THIRD LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1832 TO 1835.]

The first Liberal Lord High Commissioner—His illegal Reform of the Constitution—The first Parliament which was dissolved by the King—Law Reforms—Financial Measures—Inconsistency—His Economy and Surplus—Change of Ministers in England—Lord Nugent resigns—His Memory cherished.

LORD NUGENT was the first liberal Lord High Commissioner sent to Corfu, and his memory is in consequence very popular with the majority of the Ionians. Having assisted in carrying out great parliamentary reforms in his own country, it was generally hoped that he would rapidly put a stop to the despotic nature of the Anglo-Ionian Government. Arriving at Corfu on the 30th of November, 1832, he published on the day following —the 1st of December—a proclamation, promising reforms and the redress of grievances; although, at the same time, he praised his predecessors for having kept the Islands quiet, amidst surrounding

troubles and disturbances. He told the Ionians that the project of a code of laws then preparing was sanctioned by the Protecting Power. He added, that where they differed from British law, they were suited to the customs and habits of the people. He spoke in favour of education and religious liberty, and he paid some compliments to the laws of ancient Greece.

In March, 1833, the fourth Ionian Parliament assembled at Corfu. The three first Parliaments had successively expired on completing (from March, 1818, to February, 1833) their several regular quinquennia.*

Lord Nugent introduced, on his own authority, a liberal but illegal innovation in the election of the fourth Parliament, which was certainly an imprudent and improper proceeding. The electors were presented with triple instead of double lists, from which to choose their members. They were also, within those limits, allowed freedom of choice. Generally speaking, the Assembly appears to have been the freest which had yet been elected; a fact of which they were personally assured by Lord Nugent. They immediately commenced some innovations, and carried with violence a law to make, for the first time, their discussions public. But as the manner of election had been illegal, this Par-

* The first constituent Assembly of 1817 was not reckoned as one of the regular Parliaments.

liament had, in consequence, a very brief career. It occasioned the first exercise, by the King in Council, of the power of dissolution invested in his Majesty by the constitution. The order, spontaneously sent from home it appears, and not at Lord Nugent's own suggestion, brought the proceedings of the fourth Parliament to a sudden and summary close.

The fifth Parliament was elected from the double list, in accordance with the constitution. Lord Nugent felt disgusted at the ingratitude with which his liberal plans and intentions had been received, and with the abuse and calumnies of which he became the object. In his opening speech to the new Parliament, which assembled in March, 1834, he alluded to the ambition of parties, and to the unworthy sentiments of private interest, by which the public good had been obstructed. He counselled the deputies to refrain from vain discussions, and from impracticable desires, and not to hasten on great changes before the people were prepared to receive them. But it was not possible for him to restrain the passions which he had let loose ever since his landing, by his evident condemnation of the policy of his predecessors. He undoubtedly gave the first blow to the stability of the Protectorate, so far as that depended upon the cheerful submission of the majority of the inhabitants.

Lord Nugent turned his attention to the courts

of justice, the practice of which he improved. He caused it to be ruled, that after two years no man should be again tried for his life in Italian. But the time had not arrived for carrying out all legal proceedings in Greek, for which many and long-preparatory labours were necessary; that language having so long been banished from official and even from social use. His lordship also undertook the task of preparing a new code of laws for the Islands, a measure greatly required.

Sir Frederick Adam, besides great sums for fortifications, had charged to the Ionian budget a number of other military expenses. The total sum was estimated, by a good authority, as averaging more than 50,000*l.* a year.* Lord Nugent obtained the sanction of the Home Government to his arranging with the Assembly to limit for the future the total sum to be paid to the Protectorate to 35,000*l.* a year; 15,000*l.* of which was appropriated to the English part of the Ionian civil list.

It was hoped that Lord Nugent would have given greater liberty than his predecessors had done to the

* Napier. Naval and military establishment in Sir Frederick Adam's time . . . . . 28,000*l.*
Fortifications . . . . . 23,000*l.*
Total . . . 51,000*l.*

A heavy charge, as Colonel Napier observes, on a revenue of 140,000*l.* a year. A parliamentary return calls Lord Nugent's the first convention. It was the first convention that limited the amount, but Sir Frederick Adam had, in accordance with the Treaty of Paris, as he imagined, obtained the Assembly's consent to his charges.

action of the Senate. But one of the ablest and most upright, as well as noblest of his senators, the Count Delladecima,* complained that his Excellency maintained the wonted despotism in the Council; and that he always checked the expression of opinion when it differed from his own. The same thing occurred with the Assembly. He encouraged at first its freedom of action, but became angry directly that action was not in accordance with his own views. So difficult is it for the most liberal man not to be injuriously affected by the possession of unlimited power. Lord Nugent ejected from office a number of old servants of the Protectorate, and substituted for them young and inexperienced men of liberal opinions. Some of these—according to the testimony of the ablest Resident next to Napier ever employed in the Islands—were unable even to write, from want of education.†

Finding the pension-fund lying useless in the treasury, Lord Nugent employed it in loans of money, at six per cent., to the peasantry.‡ The excellence of this measure can be appreciated only by those who are aware of the horrible system of exorbitant usury, by which the peasants were left

* In the Introduction, at page 29, is narrated the honorable manner in which the first Count Delladecima obtained his title, the date of which is 1704.

† Baron d'Everton, the Resident (for twenty years), first of Cephalonia, and afterwards of Santa Maura.

‡ Jervis.

to the mercy of their landlords. Sir Thomas Maitland, although he had endeavoured to mitigate, had not possessed the same means for remedying the evil. For the pension-fund was only commenced under his rule.

But the chief reputation left by this Lord High Commissioner was that of a good economist. Sir Thomas Maitland had found only a few pence in the Ionian treasury, and had left in it at his death 130,000*l.* Lord Nugent received from Sir Frederick Adam an empty treasury, but he left to his successor a surplus of more than 126,000*l.* However, nearly 30,000*l.* of this was the amount of the above-mentioned pension-fund, an institution due to the care and forethought of the first British ruler.* Lord Nugent somewhat lessened the revenue by lowering the duty on grain, and by other reductions, to which his successor attributed much of his embarrassment.†

In 1834 a temporary change of ministry occurred in England, in consequence of which Lord Nugent

* M. François Lenormant, who paid a short visit to the Ionian Islands a few years ago, has repeatedly published against England pamphlets, in which all the most absurd calumnies, of a very small and extreme section of Ionians, are announced as serious facts. Signor Lombardo, of Zante, is said to have crammed the young Frenchman with some of those specimens of what *Græcia mendax audet in Historia*, such as of old astonished Juvenal. The following is this author's account of Lord Nugent's surplus: "En 1833, lorsque Lord Nugent quitta le Haut Commissariat, et le remit à Sir Howard Douglas, les caisses de l'Etat Ionien renfermaient encore 126,550*l.* livres en réserve, *résultat des administrations Vénitienne, Russe et Française.*" Imagine Venetians, Russians, and French, all leaving their treasures behind them!

† Fullom's Life of Sir Howard Douglas.

(apprehending that thenceforth he would not be supported in his liberal policy) resigned his post, and returned to England, in March, 1835. His memory, in spite of many eccentricities, is still cherished in the Islands by the Liberal party generally.

CHAPTER IV.

GENERAL SIR HOWARD DOUGLAS, BART., FOURTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1835 TO 1841.]

Sir Howard Douglas appointed by a Conservative Ministry—Acts under Whigs—Imitates Sir Thomas Maitland—Improves the Aqueduct—Expels a Bishop—Philorthodox Society—Its Troubles—Lord John Russell defends Sir Howard—Sir Howard's struggles with the Liberals—Patriarch deposed —Difficulties with Lord John Russell—Sir Howard's Policy and Success—Code of Laws passed—Testimonials—Accusations of Proselytism—His Character—Orders English Officials to learn Greek—Neglect of his Orders —How his Conduct will be judged.

SIR HOWARD DOUGLAS received his appointment from a Conservative minister; but soon after his arrival at Corfu there was a change of ministry in England, the Whigs being again installed in office. This circumstance increased the difficulty of his task in maintaining tranquillity and contentment in the Islands. It emboldened the Liberal party to oppose his government, and to make frequent appeals to the ministry at home. They confidently believed that the Whig Colonial Minister would only be too happy to find fault with and, if pos-

sible, to recall the Conservative Lord High Commissioner. But in this they were mistaken. The ministers appear to have felt the inconvenience that would arise from mixing up the domestic and party politics of England with the government of a valuable foreign dependency. It was determined, therefore, to confirm Sir Howard Douglas in his post, and to support his government so long as it could be done conscientiously. The memorials of the Ionian agitators were, therefore, returned to them unanswered by the Colonial Minister.*

The appointment of a staunch Conservative had alarmed the Liberal party in the Islands, the influence and hopes of which had been so raised by the promises of Lord Nugent. Sir Howard found himself attacked as soon as he had assumed office by a strong and violent opposition. But he was not a man to be deterred by threats or abuse. He made no secret of his admiration for Sir Thomas Maitland, and of his determination to tread in his and Sir Frederick Adam's footsteps. Before his arrival, he appears to have well studied the past history of the Islands; and he had arrived at the decided conviction that the Ionians were wholly unfit for self-government, in the English sense of the term. The frankness with which he announced these views gave general offence, and excited to fury the Liberal party. The restless intrigues and secret

* The Marquis of Normanby.

conspiracies against the government sorely tried the temper and patience of the Lord High Commissioner. For although both the fifth and sixth Parliaments were elected in accordance with the constitution of 1817, yet Lord Nugent's rule had strengthened the Liberal party even in the Assembly. The latter was not, therefore, as pliable as its predecessors had been to the wishes of government. The sixth Parliament opened on the 1st March, 1839. The Assembly instantly began by disputing the right of the Senate to take part in the formation of the new code of laws. The secret society of the Hetairia was also discovered in the same year; and the Greek journals were in consequence refused admission into the Ionian Islands.

Sir Howard Douglas was resolved to rule despotically, as the two first Commissioners had done, conscientiously believing such a course to be necessary. But he was also, like them, anxious to confer material benefits on the Islands. Notwithstanding Russian intrigues both at Athens and in the Ionian Islands, he endeavoured to cultivate a good understanding with the government of Otho, with the view to the reciprocal advantages of commerce. He also promoted the formation of roads; whilst his scientific talents obtained a useful field in repairing the aqueduct made by Sir Frederick Adam, and in correcting some defects in its

original construction.* He moreover built a poor-house and a lunatic asylum; improved the prisons; and spent large sums on education. He also frustrated an attempt made by the Pope to establish a Roman Catholic see in the Ionian Islands. A person called at the palace, and described himself as the Bishop of Corfu, but he was ordered to leave the island within twenty-four hours, and he obeyed the imperative mandate. Had he hesitated, the powers of the high police, as his Excellency informed him, would have been quickly brought into action.

Sir Howard Douglas greatly asssisted Sir Edmund Lyons, the English minister at Athens, with his moral support in checking the cruelty and tyranny exercised over the Greeks by King Otho and his corrupt government: and he exposed those disgraceful proceedings in his Government *Gazette* to the contempt of the Ionian people. But many of these, tampered with by Russian influence and by the agents of Otho, strenuously denied the misgovernment at Athens, which was patent to all Europe; and they retorted, moreover, on Sir Howard by the most atrocious calumnies. The ranks of his enemies were swelled by disappointed ambition, but this misfortune is

* Dr. Davy. Mr. Fullom, in his *Life of Sir Howard Douglas*, makes a singular mistake in attributing to him the original formation of the aqueduct, p. 318:—"The town of Corfu had long suffered from a scarcity of water, and he looked around for a source of supply, which he found on a neighbouring height, where it had been unheeded before."

hardly worthy of mention. It has been common to all Lord High Commissioners, and it is common, indeed, to rulers everywhere. Count Bulgari, one of the first nobles of Corfu, became, it is said, the irreconcilable enemy of Sir Howard Douglas, because he was not reappointed for the third time as President of the Senate. Few persons will now pretend (as so many formerly did) that the Philorthodox Society was a myth, or an invention of the English Government. All honest Ionians—the majority, that is—now confess the truth, and many glory in the fact. Why, indeed, should Greeks be ashamed of having belonged to a society whose grand idea was a general rising of the Greek race with a view to the restoration of the empire of Constantinople? The plan of driving the Mahomedans out of Europe might be deemed visionary, but could never be considered dishonourable by Greeks. But England, as the friend of Turkey, was bound, she believed, sternly to repress all such attempts. It appears, however, that a revolution in Greece, and the dethronement of Otho, formed a part of the general plan. The ramifications of the plot were discovered in Cephalonia, and in the other islands, as well as in Corfu. The Bishops of Ithaca and Paxo also received overtures from the Philorthodox Society in Greece at the commencement of 1848.

The want of morality in many Greeks is to

frequently displayed by a marked contempt for facts. It is this lamentable defect which, more than any other, has checked in Great Britain the natural feelings of interest which would otherwise have been universally felt for the Hellenic race. It is a common saying in England, that facts are stubborn things. In Greece there is no such proverb. Greeks cherish very grand ideas, before which they are of opinion that everything, including truth, should unhesitatingly be made to bend. Many of them, indeed, seldom tell a fact as it really occurred, unless by so doing it suits their immediate purposes. Moreover, having advanced an untruth, they too often support it with the most invincible obstinacy. If the detection be so clear that denial appears to be impossible, then the falsehood is dropped for the moment without shame or apology, and only to be used again on the first opportunity.*

Sir Howard Douglas experienced the truth of these remarks. Lord John Russell had succeeded the Marquis of Normanby as Colonial Minister. The Whig Minister, no especial friend to the Lord High Commissioner, was nevertheless unmistakably disgusted with the false accusations and calumnious insinuations of certain Ionians. A more upright, honourable, and high-minded man than Sir Howard

* These remarks do not apply to the majority of the Ionian gentry, who, the author trusts, are destined to reform the great defect of so many of their countrymen.

Douglas never existed, whatever may have been the errors of his government. Was it wonderful, then, that low personal calumnies against such an English gentleman should be sternly rebuked by Lord John Russell, in spite of difference of party politics?

Fighting with such unworthy weapons, ruinous to the best cause, and which the spirit of honor, if not of religion, should have repudiated, it could not be surprising that the Ionian Liberals failed to obtain the support of the Government or people of England. Sir Howard Douglas continued his career, irrespective of these foolish and ill-directed attacks, with unshaken energy and resolution. The power of the high police, supported by the British garrison in case of need, lent an irresistible physical force to the aid of his moral resolution. The smallest attempts at disturbances were everywhere throughout the Islands suppressed with a high hand, amidst the compulsory submission of the Liberal party.

But Sir Howard sought also to please, by material benefits, the people whom he ruled so despotically.* He was of opinion that even the 35,000*l.* a year to which the Government of his predecessor had limited the payments to England by the Ionian treasury was too great a burden on the revenue.

* Sir Howard made an excellent appointment, that of Sir George Marcoran (who had first entered into public life in Cephalonia at the request of Sir Charles Napier) to be a member of the Supreme Council of Justice, September 19, 1840; his predecessor, Judge Delladecima, having *resigned from ill-health*. Sir George Marcoran was shelved by Sir Henry Storks in 1862.

He requested, therefore, permission to abolish that charge, and to spend the amount in internal improvements. Although the request obtained only a partial success, it was deserving of gratitude from the Ionians. On the contrary, however, it became the foundation of fresh calumnies, as if His Excellency had been actuated by mean and selfish motives in making such a request. The conduct in this respect of the Chevalier Mustoxidi, the able but unscrupulous enemy of the Lord High Commissioner, was justly reprobated by Lord John Russell.

Sir Howard Douglas continued after his arrival the task of his predecessor, by preparing a new code of laws.* One of his proposed measures interfered with the old law of marriage, which extended to absurd lengths the restrictive degrees of affinity. This was interpreted by the Liberals into an attack upon religion. The Patriarch of Constantinople, at the instigation of Russia, encouraged the outcry against the innovation. The Assembly and the people were in a ferment. An unconstitutional motion was about to be made regarding the money guaranteed to England. The Lord High Commissioner had obtained a reluctant permission from Lord John Russell to dissolve the Parliament in case of necessity, of which he now availed himself in December, 1839. The sixth Parliament

* Mr. Fullom is mistaken in supposing that the idea of the new code of laws originated with Sir Howard Douglas. To Lord Nugent that credit is justly due.

had not lasted nine months. His next operation was to seize the papers of a number of gentlemen supposed to be connected with the Philorthodox Society. It may be believed, however, that these papers contained nothing which the English Government could consider as treasonable, for no steps were taken either to publish their contents or to punish those with whom they were found.* In consequence, the Liberal party were the better enabled to persist in their assertions that no such society really existed. In these repressive proceedings Sir Howard appears to have been somewhat hasty. He acted as if there had existed a real danger of the forcible expulsion of the English from the Islands. He forgot that those who are very strong can afford to be very generous. He adopted measures of repression akin to those which, when exercised by Continental despots, have ever excited the indignation of Englishmen.

There were, however, ample proofs that Count George Capodistrias, a younger brother of the murdered President of the Greek Republic, residing at Athens, was planning a general rising of the Greeks, and had already opened communications for that purpose with the Patriarch of

* For Mr. Fullom's assertion, that Sir Howard could have brought these gentlemen to the gallows, I cannot account. He was repeatedly defied by Count Viaro Capodistrias, and others, to prove that anything criminal had been established against the gentlemen, whose papers were seized at Corfu, and never answered the challenge.

Constantinople. By the joint action of Sir Howard Douglas; of Sir Edmund Lyons, the minister at Athens; and of the English ambassador at Constantinople, the necessary impulse was given to the Porte. Soon the *Corfu Gazette* announced to the Ionians that the Patriarch of Constantinople had been deposed.*

A letter arrived from Lord John Russell, when it was too late, forbidding the dissolution of the Ionian Parliament. The persevering attacks of the Ionians, however much marred by exaggerations and calumnies, began to have some effect on the Colonial Minister. Not that he ever appears to have credited, to the very last, anything in the least derogatory to the character of Sir Howard. But he began to think his system too haughty and unconciliating. Doubtless, also, he felt (though prudence forbade his publishing such an opinion), the false position in which England, especially reformed England, stood before the Ionian people in regard to the Treaty of Paris. The Lord High Commissioner, a staunch Conservative, had none of these qualms of conscience. He believed that Great Britain retained the Islands partly for its own purposes, but still more for the benefit of the Ionians, and of Europe generally. He rightly considered that the continuance of the Protectorate

* Fullom.

would be rendered impossible from the moment that complete freedom and independence were ensured to the Ionian people. Events have proved the accuracy of his foresight. But it must not be supposed that even Sir Howard Douglas believed that England had fully done its duty to the Islands. In a despatch to the Colonial Minister, he wrote: "Truth and a strong sense of duty compel me to declare that the internal state of the country, the moral and physical state of the people, have not been benefited by British connexion, so far as to protect us hereafter from the reproach of having attended less to their interests than to our own."* He also brought to the notice of the English Government the evils resulting from the liability of the judges to be removed every five years. But no steps were taken to alter the rule.

The seventh Parliament opened on the 24th February, 1840. The Government had energetically exerted the means furnished by the constitution of 1817, to elect an obedient and submissive Assembly. The effects of Lord Nugent's liberal policy had now disappeared. All the officials were again, as in the time of Sir Thomas Maitland, the faithful servants of the Protectorate. The victories of Sir Howard Douglas over the Pope, and over the Patriarch and the extreme Liberals, had now consolidated his government. In vain the hostile and able Cheva-

* Fullom.

lier Mustoxidi,* and the furious Papanicolas of London, wrote letters and pamphlets to Lord John Russell, in which unfounded calumnies were mixed up with some severe truths. The success of Sir Howard was complete. In addition to his other acts he had the honor of promulgating the code of laws commenced by his predecessor, and finished by himself. They passed the Assembly with few alterations, and were duly confirmed by the Queen. The obsequious Assembly wished to petition her Majesty to prolong the government of Sir Howard Douglas, but he had the good sense to desire the passage to be expunged from the address. He acted wisely, coming as it did from an Assembly elected rigidly in accordance with the constitution of 1817, and completely subservient to himself. Moreover, he felt the increasing coldness and hesitation of Lord John Russell's support, and he resented his frequent injunctions in favour of conciliation. He did not, however, object to the vote of a monument in his own honor; and an obelisk placed a little beyond the Esplanade was after his departure duly erected to his memory. The ladies of Corfu also presented a handsome testimonial to Lady Douglas, whose

* The Chevalier Mustoxidi died at Corfu in 1861, when the writer of these pages attended his public funeral. At the time of his death he held the office of archon, which he had resigned in Sir Howard's rule, and had become apparently a staunch Protectionist, though he has been accused of having been the secret agent of Russia.

amiable virtues had given so pleasing and healthy a tone to Ionian society. The testimonials were sincere proofs of the attachment of the upper classes, but not certainly of the Ionians generally. The great majority of landed proprietors, who had much to lose, were ever alive to the benefit of British protection to a half-civilized race. Security of life and property were in their eyes more important than liberty and independence, especially as they could see no reasonable signs that the time for realizing the great national idea had yet arrived.

An Ionian, famed for reckless assertions, accused the Lord High Commissioner of having endeavoured to make proselytes amongst the people. The only foundation for this accusation was the fact that some dissenting missionary, entirely of his own accord, occasioned a riot in Corfu by attempting, most imprudently, to disseminate amongst the people some papers containing extracts from the New Testament.

In the time of Sir Howard Douglas, it was but a small party which openly advocated the Union; so impracticable an idea was it then generally considered, even by the Liberals.*

* In 1839, Mustoxidi wrote in his memorial to the Colonial Minister: "There is not in the Ionian Islands a heart that does not prefer British protection to any other political condition, but every one has sense enough to distinguish between Britain and her representative." Signor Papanicolas, in his pamphlets, repeatedly made the same assertion in favour of the Protectorate.

In his private capacity, Sir Howard was the model of an English gentleman. He has been accused of being too aristocratic, which is the only charge made against his personal character by Ionians of honour and respectability. In society, Sir Howard and Lady Douglas gave the much-needed example of strict propriety; and the doors of the palace were closed against persons of indifferent character or conduct. The hospitality of the Lord High Commissioner was unbounded, and by acquiring him many friends amongst travellers of distinction, helped to extend in England a good opinion of his government.

Of all the Lord High Commissioners, Sir Howard Douglas appears to have been the only one who disapproved of the manner in which the English Residencies and other civil posts were habitually given to Englishmen wholly ignorant of the language necessary in order to perform their duties efficiently. For although in his day Greek had not yet become the language of the law, or of official acts, yet in anticipation of the period when they were decreed to become so, he caused his secretary, on the 28th of January, 1837, to write the following circular to the English officials:

"SIR,—I am directed by the Lord High Commissioner to draw your attention to the Act passed in the last extraordinary session of Parliament, re-

lative to the introduction of the Greek and English as languages of the State, and to acquaint you that a knowledge of the Greek language will be required of the British functionaries whenever this measure shall be practically adopted or enforced, and that it is, consequently, incumbent on them, to make themselves masters of that language."

Will it be believed by Englishmen, that in 1863, twenty-five years after this sensible and rational order was given, no Resident was ever required to know Greek, nor was his even knowing Italian imperative?* As the only Lord High Commissioner ever anxious to remove such a national disgrace, the memory of Sir Howard Douglas deserves to be held in respect. He also made great efforts to improve agriculture in the Islands. But intrigues, and the unbusiness-like habits of the people crippled his efforts, and rendered them almost nugatory.

The government of Sir Howard as a whole, will in England be judged, like that of Sir Thomas Maitland, according to the politics of the reader. If he be a Conservative, and also believe that the Islands should not have been ceded, then he must

* This appears to be a truly English fault. Lord Macaulay (speaking of the Darien enterprise) gives us an instance of it in the fifth volume of his History, page 233, closing with this remark: "Even after all we have seen of the perverse imbecility of the directors of the company, it seems strange that they should have sent a colony to a remote part of the world, where it was certain that there must be constant intercourse, peaceable or hostile, with the Spaniards, and yet should not have taken care that there should be in the whole colony a single person who knew a little Spanish."

approve of his general policy, though he may regret that it was sullied by a somewhat haughty despotism. But he will be disposed to condemn that policy if he be a Liberal, or one who prefers justice to political expediency. But let such a reader remember that, at the period referred to, no Englishman ever imagined the possibility of that cession, which has now taken place in 1863, to the astonishment of the civilized world.

Sir Howard wished the Ionian people to be prepared for free institutions by sure and gradual means. This he intimated to the Parliament in his farewell speech of 1841, of which the following is an extract:

"I must earnestly recommend a steady perseverance in this laudable spirit, and a prosecution of those measures, and a cherishing of those institutions, which can alone prepare the Ionian people to discharge properly the arduous duties which free institutions impose; institutions, however, which if prematurely introduced would prove a far greater injury than a boon to the people themselves; for becoming the sport and prey of a few ambitious and intriguing men, the Ionian people would neither have the benefit and protection of a stable Government, nor the energy and vigour of a free state."

In his financial measures, Sir Howard Douglas was not fortunate. Sir Frederick Adam was the only one of his predecessors who had left no surplus

in the treasury. Sir Howard was the first to incur debts. Lord Nugent left in the treasury 126,550*l.* Not only did his successor spend this surplus, but in spite of an increased revenue he incurred a debt estimated at 150,450*l.*; nearly 80,000*l.* of which was due to the Protecting Government.*

The reduction of taxes by Lord Nugent have been mentioned as occasioning the debts of Sir Howard Douglas; but the validity of the excuse has not been established. The duty on grain, abolished by Lord Nugent, was reimposed by his successor. Moreover, the falling off of the revenue did not commence till a few years after the arrival of the latter. But for the first four years of his rule, his expenditure greatly exceeded that of Lord Nugent, and was considerably in excess of the revenue. It was, therefore, the great increase of his expenditure, in public works and improvements, which occasioned the very considerable deficit, which Sir Howard Douglas unfortunately left behind him, in the place of the large surplus he had found on his arrival.

* Vide Appendix C. Sir Howard's expenditure was always greatly in excess of his revenue. In 1838, the excess fell little short of 50,000*l.*, the revenue being 203,240*l.*, and the expenditure 250,195*l.*

CHAPTER V.

MR. MACKENZIE, FIFTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1841 TO 1843.]

Mr. Mackenzie's Difficulties—Appoints a new President of the Senate—Noble Conduct of Count Delladecima—Permanent Judges desirable—Mr. Mackenzie's Economy—Error which led to his Recall.

THE hopes of the Liberal party in the Ionian Islands were revived by the appointment of Mr. Mackenzie. The substitution of a Whig civilian for a Tory general was hailed with joy. With a Liberal Commissioner in the Islands, and a Liberal Government at home, great things were naturally to be expected. Nor did Mr. Mackenzie disappoint those expectations. Had his rule been prolonged to the usual period, he would undoubtedly have been the great reformer of the Ionian constitution, instead of leaving the task to his successor, Lord Seaton. There is reason to believe that his reforms would have been more gradual, moreover, and therefore less destructive in their tendencies than the rapid and

extraordinary changes of Lord Seaton. But to Mr. Mackenzie there happened a misfortune similar to that which had occurred to his predecessor. Appointed by a minister of his own party, he had to serve the greater part of his time under the control of a political opponent. The Earl of Derby,* the new Colonial Minister (acting on the Whig precedent), did not immediately recall Mr. Mackenzie, but the latter soon experienced the coldness of his official support. Moreover, the party in the Islands opposed to reforms kept up a correspondence with Sir Howard Douglas, now become a Conservative member of the English Parliament. It was only natural that Sir Howard, as a lately returned Commissioner of Conservative politics, should have had great influence with the Earl of Derby. It was equally natural that he should be opposed to the Ionian policy of Mr. Mackenzie, both as a party man and on personal grounds. For the policy of his successor was the direct condemnation of his own. Indeed, the former (with bad taste, as many thought, or with proper frankness, as others considered it) had hinted soon after his arrival his disapproval of the financial measures of his predecessor.† It is also believed that the new Lord High Commissioner was not sufficiently obedient to

* Then Lord Stanley.

† It is reported that in his first speech to the Senate (of which I have no copy), he stated that the payment of the debts left by Sir Howard Douglas would necessitate the sale of national property.

the instructions of his ministerial chief. It is certain that the position of Mr. Mackenzie had become embarrassing, and that it was difficult for him to retain his post without some sacrifice of his political independence. Mr. Mackenzie, however, determined to carry out at all risks his schemes of reform. But the Senate, including the President, were the faithful nominees, and were also wedded to the system of his predecessor. He found himself opposed by the Senate in his proposed measures of reform. It did not appear to him that he could govern in harmony with the President of the Senate, who had been appointed on the recommendation of Sir Howard Douglas. Now the constitution furnished him (in the second year of his rule) with the desired opportunity. Whilst the members of the Senate were named for five years, the President was appointed only for two years and a half. At the end of that period the Lord High Commissioner was authorized either to renew the appointment for the remainder of the quinquennium, or to name a new President. Although the constitution gave the first nomination of the President of the Senate to the Sovereign of Great Britain, no such reference was ordered in the case of renewal or non-reappointment; though of course every Colonial Minister would expect to be informed, and even to be consulted, on such occasions. Mr. Mackenzie, it is said, did notify to Lord Derby his intentions not to reappoint the

President, whose first period of office was about to expire. Not receiving any answer in time, he proceeded to exercise his undoubted right. Signor Petrizzopulo, the friend of Sir Howard Douglas, was shelved, and the Count Delladecima was substituted as President of the Senate for the remainder of the quinquennium. This was the first time that a Lord High Commissioner had exerted his power of non-reappointment in such a case.* Signor Petrizzopulo was a respectable man, of mediocre abilities, and a staunch Protectionist.† The Count Demetrius Delladecima was perhaps the best living specimen of an amiable, clever, and high-minded Ionian noble. No selection could have been better. For he, too, was a Protectionist, though in favour of moderate reforms. Lord Derby, influenced partly, no doubt, by Sir Howard Douglas, but also probably by a wish to strengthen the Protectionist party, disapproved of Mr. Mackenzie's proceedings. But he could not annul the legal act of the Lord High Commissioner. He could only express his displeasure. Mr. Mackenzie proceeded to England, and there offered his resignation. But he was ordered to return to Corfu, and from thence to

* Such a case was not likely to occur, except when the Lord High Commissioner, who had to renew the appointment *himself*, had not been the original recommender of the appointment to the Crown, and was not satisfied with the President in office.

† It is perhaps necessary to explain to the general reader that *Protectionist* in these pages does not signify an opponent of free trade, but a supporter of the continuance of British protection over the Islands.

send in his resignation. What the Colonial Minister had not the power to abolish was annulled by the noble disinterestedness of Count Delladecima. For as soon as he learned the embarrassment into which his appointment had brought Mr. Mackenzie, he immediately sent to Lord Derby his resignation of that post, which was ever under the British Protectorate, the highest object of an Ionian's ambition. Mr. Mackenzie, by order of Lord Derby, accepted the resignation, and Signor Petrizzopulo was reappointed for the remainder of the quinquennium.

The conduct of Count Demetrius Delladecima could not but excite the admiration of such chivalrous gentlemen as the Earl of Derby* and Sir Howard Douglas. He was afterwards rewarded by being made President of the Assembly, a post nominally filled by the election of the Assembly itself, but in reality, though indirectly, in the gift of the Lord High Commissioner. Mr. Mackenzie sent in his resignation in December, 1842, and died soon after he left Corfu, as much, it is said, from mortified feelings as from physical disease. In spite of some errors, and a want of tact in his intercourse with higher authority, he left behind him the character of the most liberal and the best-intentioned of all the Lord High Commissioners. To

* Lord Derby wrote to Count Delladecima a letter bearing testimony to his considerate and handsome conduct. It begins "Highness," in accordance with the presidential style, and it is considered a valuable document by the distinguished family in whose possession it remains. The count died in 1844.

this day, no serious fault is ever attributed to him by Ionians of any party, and his departure was generally considered a serious loss to the Islands and to the popularity of the English Protectorate.

Mr. Mackenzie felt the great evils arising from the constant change of judges. It made them political partisans, and lessened the chance of their performing their duties impartially. Sir Thomas Maitland had evidently contemplated as a desirable law the immovability of the judges at some future period. Sir Howard Douglas entertained similar views. It was said by some that the many cases of misconduct in judges forbade such a change. It might have been replied that upright judges would with difficulty be found when political partisanship became the only secure path to office. There was certainly something to be said on both sides. Mr. Mackenzie desired that the office of judge after five years of good conduct should be made permanent. This project was not sanctioned by the Earl of Derby. His lordship, however, has lived to be astonished to find that even twenty-three years of unimpeachable conduct as a judge of the Supreme Court could not save, in 1863, so excellent an Ionian as Sir George Marcoran from virtual supercession, entailing a serious curtailment of his justly-merited pension.

Mr. Mackenzie studied economy in theory and carried it out in practice. But his rule in the

Islands was too brief to effect much. He, however, it appears, reduced the debt from 150,000*l.* to 131,000*l.*, notwithstanding that he lightened the taxes, so that his revenue was much less than that of his predecessor.* His great fault, as already mentioned, was his want of tact in not perceiving that the change of ministry had altered his position. How could he with reason expect the cordial support of the Conservative Colonial Minister if he persisted in a policy which could not but be regarded as the virtual condemnation of Sir Howard Douglas, also a Conservative, and the friend of the minister? Had he followed the example of Lord Nugent under similar circumstances, and resigned his post when he found that his principles were opposed to those of his official chief, he would have saved himself the mortification and humiliation under the gloomy shade of which he finally departed from the Islands.

In a social point of view, Mr. Mackenzie left behind him a pleasing impression by the amiability of his disposition and the irreproachable tenor of his conduct.

* Vide Appendix C.

CHAPTER VI.

LORD SEATON, SIXTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1843 TO 1849.]

Lord Seaton—Revolution in Greece of 1843—District Courts—Santa Maura Canal—Cause of Lord Seaton's Change of Policy—Earl Grey's Cautions—Baron d'Everton's difficult Position in Cephalonia—Inefficient Local Police—Procession Riot—Lord Seaton warned in vain—Treachery of Subordinates—The Surprise of Argostoli—Its Attack by Peasantry—Colonel Trollope—Lord Seaton in Cephalonia—His chief Reforms—His Inconsistency—A Self-contradictory Constitution—Murder of Captain Parker on the Black Mountain—A faithful Dog—Removal of Baron d'Everton—An incompetent Successor—Eighth Parliament—Interruptions of Debates—Unionists encouraged, not satisfied—Ionians love Nationality more than Freedom—Lord Seaton an Unionist—Cause of his Popularity—Unjust Criticisms on him—His Character.

ON the 1st of April, 1843, Lord Seaton began his memorable rule in the Ionian Islands. In his first speech to the Legislative Assembly, he alluded in a disparaging manner to the financial career of Sir Howard Douglas, and to the surplus, which that officer had converted into a considerable debt. It was hoped that, thus alive to the errors of the past, Lord Seaton would have cleared away the

debt during his own administration. But by his lordship's own statement to the Legislative Assembly, in March, 1844, his expenditure exceeded his income. Again in April, 1849, he stated that the debt left by Sir Howard had increased, not diminished, in 1847. At the final departure of Lord Seaton, moreover, the total debt of the State had been considerably increased.* In general policy he appears during the first five years of his rule to have followed the example of Sir Thomas Maitland, by keeping all power firmly in his own hands.† He, however, very early introduced many improvements, which will be mentioned hereafter.

In September, 1843, a revolution occurred in the kingdom of Greece, which overthrew for the time the despotism of King Otho. The National Assembly met on the 20th of November of the same year, and terminated its labours on the 30th of March, 1844. King Otho swore obedience to the constitution, and the hated Bavarians were expelled from the kingdom.‡ Hopes were now entertained of an improved rule at Athens, and an encouraging impulse was given to that large party in the Ionian Islands which already evidently desired an union with Greece. But it does not appear that the Greek revolution had much effect on the policy of Lord Seaton.§

* Vide Appendix C. † Bowen. ‡ Finlay.

§ I have nowhere found any proof of the truth of the late M. Papanicolas's assertion, that Lord Seaton's reforms of 1848-9 were caused by his lordship's

The seventh Parliament, which had been the complacent tool of Sir Howard Douglas, having completed its legal quinquennium, expired; and the eighth Parliament assembled on the 1st of March, 1845, under the auspices of Lord Seaton. No reforms took place in the manner of calling this Assembly, and the full powers of the Government, and of the constitution of 1817, were exerted to make it as docile a servant as its predecessor, and with every success.* For the great innovations which three years later this Parliament introduced were the result of the change in the councils and in the opinions of the Lord High Commissioner himself. Meantime, Lord Seaton's measures were such as might naturally be expected from a Conservative peer who had put down the Canadian rebellion with military firmness and decision. He followed in the Islands the policy of his Conservative predecessors. He permitted no free press, nor any other expression of public opinion, whilst he carried out his own plans of moral and material improvement. He introduced some excellent measures. Education and schools prospered under his sway. He conferred a very great boon on the poor inhabitants by the appointment (as early as in 1844)

reflections on the revolution at Athens in 1843; but if it were so, those reflections were very long in maturing into action.

* Bowen. Papanicolas, who contradicted nearly everything written by Sir George Bowen, did not deny the fact.

of district courts, for the settlement of minor legal cases. The peasants were thus saved the great expense and loss of time of attending, or being taken to, the courts in the capitals of the Islands in cases of slight offences or disputes. He built an excellent prison. He endeavoured also to teach the Corfiots agriculture, by making good laws regarding roads, and also by means of a model farm; and though he failed in the latter object, the attempt was praiseworthy. His canal at Santa Maura is said to have cost 28,000*l.* It is to this day unfinished, as every Assembly since Lord Seaton's ' departure has refused the additional 10,000*l.* necessary to complete it. If finished, it would greatly have facilitated the commerce of the Islands, and Lord Seaton does not deserve to be condemned for attempting to carry out so useful a design.

The French revolution, which occurred in February, 1848, and which was imitated in Germany, Italy, and Greece, appears to have been the true cause of the signal change of policy which Lord Seaton in that year adopted in the Ionian Islands. The Tory peer suddenly assumed the character of an extremely Liberal agitator. He prepared to grant to the Ionians democratical reforms of the most important kind. If universal local report be credited, Lord Seaton's son greatly contributed to

the change in his lordship's views. In March, 1848, he proposed to grant liberty of the press, and to give to the Assembly more power over the extraordinary expenses. For this he obtained the sanction of Earl Grey, the then Colonial Minister. That these changes were really influenced by the disturbed state of Europe is fully proved by a letter from Earl Grey to Lord Seaton, dated the 24th of April, 1848. Lord Grey writes that he trusts that the sanction given to the freedom of the press "will have enabled you to allay any excitement amongst the Ionian people which the events in the neighbouring States may have produced."* Besides a free press, Lord Seaton introduced the free election of the municipal officers in all the Islands. These officers, with good salaries, became of course entirely and slavishly dependent on the people. In July, 1848, he proposed new changes, which should make the Parliament as democratic as the municipality. Lord Grey, great colonial reformist as he had proved himself to be, became nevertheless alarmed. In October of the same year, the Whig minister cautioned the Tory peer against making hasty innovations. He warned his correspondent that concessions once made could not be withdrawn. He recommended a longer trial of the

* This remark was of course in reply to Lord Seaton's information that such excitements existed, and that concessions were advisable. It proves, in spite of the reckless assertions of Papanicolas's pamphlet, that Sir George Bowen was right in attributing Lord Seaton's reforms to the troubles of Europe in 1848.

changes already introduced, before attempting more novelties. But Lord Seaton persisted; and in March, 1849, Earl Grey yielded, candidly owning that it was not possible for him to form his own judgment and opinion as to the probable effects of the changes recommended by the Lord High Commissioner.* Thus Lord Grey threw entirely on Lord Seaton the responsibility of the great political changes about to be introduced. That he should have done so will appear the more extraordinary considering the events which took place in Cephalonia during 1848 and 1849, and of which it is time to give some account.

Cephalonia was destined to give great trouble both to Lord Seaton and to his successor, Sir Henry Ward. That island had been in an unsettled state for some years. As early as 1843, the date of Lord Seaton's arrival, there had been disturbances amongst the peasantry, to suppress which the military had been at various times employed. Quiet had, however, been restored without having recourse to martial law. But it was a treacherous calm. The class hatreds, especially of the peasantry towards the landlords, and the restless intrigues of political agitators, kept up a smouldering discontent, ever threatening to break out into fresh troubles. Baron d'Everton, the Resident of Cephalonia, was an Englishman of experience and ability. Whilst in

* Parliamentary papers.

the service of the Duke of Lucca, he had been made a baron, and, on quitting Italy, had been appointed to his present post. He was one of the very few Residents who, by his talents and knowledge of languages, was fitted to represent his country, and to extend her influence. Yet with all his advantages he found his post one of very great difficulty. Even the friends of the Protectorate, from that want of moral courage for which the Ionian gentry have ever been so conspicuous, gave him but little assistance, as was the case also with the Regent and municipal authorities. He was held responsible for the quiet of the country, and yet was deprived of the necessary powers for effectively performing his duty. In the time of Sir Charles Napier the police was entirely in the hands of the Resident. To the last the latter was the official head of the local police. But all the patronage and the chief power were concentrated in later times in the hands of the chief of the police at Corfu. The latter officer, in his ignorance of facts, frequently made bad appointments in the subordinate islands; and the Residents could no longer trust in their own police, who looked elsewhere for promotion and favour. The ill-organized and untrustworthy police of Cephalonia often aggravated the troubles which they were paid to prevent, and were sometimes even guilty of treachery to their employers.

Early in 1847, Baron d'Everton repeatedly warned Lord Seaton of the unsettled state of Cephalonia, and of the inefficiency of the police. In July of that year he reported many outrages in Argostoli and Lixuri and their neighbourhood. A few specimens will suffice. At Lixuri eight cases of housebreaking had occurred in a single week. Within the space of one month thirty cases of violent outrage had occurred altogether in Lixuri and Argostoli. Soon afterwards, in the former town, a forcible attempt at abduction took place, in order to compel a widow lady to marry a certain gentleman. Meantime, the police were supine and nearly useless. The Resident reported likewise the plunderings of wrecked ships by the mobs in the most heartless manner. He had also to take bail of violent agitators who were endeavouring to create disturbances in the island.

In the spring of 1848, on the Greek Good Friday, a disturbance occurred at Argostoli during the usual procession of the local saint, Gerasimo. The custom was for the procession to halt in front of the Residency whilst the Archbishop made a prayer. On this occasion the mob, urged on by some young gentlemen, endeavoured to force on the cenotaph from the rest of the procession. A riot ensued, but the police made some arrests, and soon re-established tranquillity. Some of the ringleaders fled the country; others were arrested, tried,

and punished with different degrees of imprisonment; but the general spirit of discontent and insubordination increased, and the cry was raised that religion had been tampered with.

In June, 1848, the Resident reported to Lord Seaton the existence of a secret Greek association for the emancipation of the Greek territory, name, and religion. It was in vain that in the midst of his troubles and fears he applied for aid to Lord Seaton. The latter refused to believe that there was any probability of serious disturbances in Cephalonia. He was all for conciliation. He did not believe that there were ten men in the island prepared to take up arms against the Government. His Corfu police, on whom he mainly depended, disregarding the reports of the better-informed local authorities, must either have grossly misled him, or must have been culpably inefficient for the extended duties which they had taken upon themselves to perform. Meantime, the conspiracy was gaining ground in Cephalonia, and there is even reason to believe that the Baron, in spite of his energy, ability, and knowledge, was deceived and betrayed by some of his subordinates, whose treachery he did not discover till it was too late; and who eventually, from various circumstances, escaped legal detection and punishment. The effect of these plots and intrigues was such, that even to this day many highly respectable persons in Cepha-

lonia believe that Baron d'Everton himself excited the insurrection, in order to prove that Lord Seaton had been wrong in his policy and short-sighted as to events. Candour compels me to say, notwithstanding my regard for the many amiable qualities of my Ionian friends, that it is only on a Greek soil that such an absurd charge against an English gentleman placed in a high position could have obtained credence from rational people.

Such was the condition of the largest of the seven islands whilst Lord Seaton was busy in carrying out a sudden and violent revolution in the Ionian constitution, in the fond confidence that when his measures should have become law, peace and content would be established in the land. But he was far from being destined to leave such a pleasing legacy to his successor.

With regard to Cephalonia, it appears that, discouraged by the rebukes and coldness of the Lord High Commissioner, Baron d'Everton had at last become somewhat less anxious and watchful. It was as if he began to doubt himself of the truth of that intended insurrection, which his chief had ever treated as a wild and unfounded idea. Only in this manner can I account for his disbelief of a warning which he received on the night of the 25th of September, 1848, from his chief of police, that the peasants were coming next morning to attack the capital of Cephalonia. That evening, at the

officers' mess, he acquainted Lieutenant-Colonel Trollope, of the 36th Regiment, commandant of the garrison, with the warning that he had received; but he added that he did not credit the report. The colonel had arranged for the next morning to go with his officers and some ladies on a party of pleasure up the Black Mountain, and the Baron assured him that there was no necessity for him to remain in town. It is clear that no proper measures of defence or precaution were taken on this occasion.

Early on the morning of the 26th of September, 1848, some hundreds of armed peasants approached Argostoli with hostile intentions. As far as can be known—for it was never clearly explained—the object of the peasants was to plunder the bank, and perhaps also the town. To this they were instigated by demagogues, who hoped to bring about a local revolution in the Government. If any persons really entertained the idea of putting an end thereby to the British Protectorate, they were few in number, and contemptible in intellect and influence.

Baron d'Everton, on being alarmed at seven A.M., hastily took with him the Residency guard, and proceeded towards the Bridge of Argostoli. From thence he went to the church of San Nicolo, at the edge of the town. Here the armed peasantry suddenly appeared in the vineyards, on both sides of

the road. Sergeant Luke Dunne, having with him only twelve men of the 36th Regiment, thought it now prudent to retire. He retreated to the head of the bridge, where he turned about and faced the pursuing peasantry. The latter commenced firing on the soldiers. Sergeant Dunne replied by steady file-firing. His position was very dangerous; for whilst with his back to the bridge he opposed the men on the mole, his rear was threatened by insurgents on the bridge, who had come from the other side. But at this moment the soldiers were reinforced by the new Residency guard, it being the hour of the daily relief. Having now twenty-four men, the sergeant defended his front and rear, and after a short personal collision the insurgents retreated, carrying off their killed and wounded. Of the troops, two were killed, and two severely wounded. It appears that the peasantry did not fire at the police, but only at the soldiers; a circumstance which is very extraordinary, and which naturally increased the suspicion of treachery entertained against that force. Neither did the peasantry act against the soldiers, except with reluctance; bidding them go to their barracks. There can be no doubt that the mob was secretly excited to action by demagogues; but whatever political object the former had in view, it vanished for the time before the immediate prospect of plunder.

Lieutenant-Colonel Trollope, when he had par-

tially ascended the Black Mountain, learned from some countrymen the true state of affairs. He returned rapidly to Argostoli, and lost no time in taking military measures for the security of the town and outposts. The weekly steamer having arrived from Zante, advantage was taken of it to send a detachment to protect and tranquillize Lixuri, which the Resident accompanied. The prisoners in that town had been disarmed, as also some of the police, whilst a part of the latter had joined the insurgents. The superintendent of police at Lixuri behaved in a cowardly or treacherous manner, and finally took refuge on board the steamer.

Lord Seaton proceeded without delay to Cephalonia, to make inquiries into the cause of the disturbances, and to pacify the island. He found fault with the Resident and Commandant for the surprise of the 26th of September, and he noticed, and promised to reward, Sergeant Luke Dunne; who subsequently received a medal and a pension for his gallant and prudent conduct. But his Excellency persisted firmly in the path of conciliation; imagining that the discontent was only of a slight and partial nature. Although the police could not be relied on very securely, Lord Seaton insisted on their being employed instead of the soldiers. His presence did no good. He left the island still in an unsettled state, to continue in Corfu his hasty

reforms, by which a great increase of political power would be given to the ill-affected peasantry, and to their unscrupulous instigators. He, however, obtained an additional regiment from England, in consequence of the state of Cephalonia.*

The Lord High Commissioner having vanquished the opposition of the Colonial Minister, continued to occupy the last months of his rule with the preparation of the most important changes in the constitution. The chief points were (in addition to the free press, and free municipal institutions) :†

1st. The abolition of the Primary Council, and of the double list of candidates, and of the integral members of the Assembly.

2nd. Perfect freedom of election as regards the members of the Assembly, who were also to be increased from forty to forty-two, in the following manner:

Corfu	10	members
Cephalonia	10	„
Zante	10	„
Santa Maura	6	„
Ithaca	2	„
Cerigo	2	„
Paxo	2	„
Total	42	

* Bowen.

† In May, 1849, the municipalities were made free.

3rd. A great increase of the constituency by reducing the requisite qualification. This measure immediately (contrary to the anticipations of Lord Seaton) trebled the number of voters on the first occasion of their voting freely. Eventually it more than quadrupled the number of electors.*

4th. Vote by ballot.

5th. Trial by jury, *confined to cases of political offences.*

Lord Seaton quickly learned at his own cost the folly of the last-named measure. Scarcely had he granted the liberty of the press, when two journals were founded by Signors Zervo and Montferrato, violent unionists of Cephalonia. They proceeded to abuse the Protectorate and to advocate union with Greece. Lord Seaton, despairing of obtaining a verdict at law against the offenders, had recourse (with singular inconsistency) to the high police powers, which he retained in his hands. Without trial of any kind, he, on his own authority, banished these gentlemen to remote and barren rocks. There they remained till released in 1850 by the amnesty of Sir Henry Ward.†

Most of Lord Seaton's innovations did not take effect in his time. He left them as a legacy to his successor. The popularity attending the introduc-

* Total number of voters in the Seven Islands in 1849 (*before* the new reforms operated) 2,824
Total number in 1850 (*after* ditto, ditto) 9,164
Total number in 1862 13,419

† Bowen.

tion of great democratic changes remained with Lord Seaton; the difficulty and the risk of carrying them out rested (as he justly complained) with Sir Henry Ward. With Lord Seaton, however, remains the real responsibility of failure. That nobleman not only acted with extreme rashness, but with equal inconsistency. The press and parliament were made free, but the executive power was left more than ever in the hands of the Lord High Commissioner. For by the new constitution the senators were appointed directly by his Excellency, instead of being only subject to his veto after election by the Assembly. He was obliged still to elect three of the Senate from the Assembly, but out of forty-two members he could have no difficulty in finding three members ready to support him. But even were it otherwise, his power remained supreme, since the President and the other two senators were appointed by him without limitation, and the President possessed a double vote. At the end of two years and a half, moreover, the President of the Senate vacated his appointment, unless it were renewed by the Lord High Commissioner for the remainder of the quinquennium.

The new reforms professed to give to the Parliament a greater command over the public purse than it had hitherto exercised. But the Parliament met only once in every two years, and could be prorogued at pleasure; whilst the rule was that, if no

new budget were voted, the old one was to be carried on. The civil list and other charges paid to the Protectorate were fixed by a convention that the Assembly could not touch; so that the lessening of the salaries of the native officials were the only financial reductions possible. But as all Ionians indulged in the idea of the possibility of attaining to office, the temptations to such reductions were not very great. They were, however, occasionally made. Lord Seaton's changes still left it in the power of the Senate, in the absence of Parliament, to make temporary laws upon extraordinary, but not defined, occasions. A Parliament that can neither stop the supplies, nor yet eject a ministry from office, is not very free, even though elected by extensive suffrage and vote by ballot. To give such an Assembly free speech, and the aid of a free press, is but to encourage discontent and sedition. The only way the Assembly could show its powers when the vast majority of it was opposed to the Government, was to vote against the introduction of all new measures whatever, without reference to their merits. This, in fact, with the occasional reduction of Ionian salaries, and the passing of votes for the Union, has been the principal occupation of the Ionian Assembly since the memorable changes of Lord Seaton took effect. His lordship did not abolish the high police powers; neither did he make any efforts to render per-

manent the judicial offices, which were still, in fact, political prizes. Never before were violent changes introduced with less reason and consistency.

Meantime, 1849 found Cephalonia as unsettled as ever, in spite of Lord Seaton's promised reforms. On the 8th of May, 1849, occurred the murder of Captain John Parker, a half-pay officer, who had the charge of the forest in the Black Mountain, where he lived, with his wife, in a little hut called the Resident's Cottage. At that solitary spot, about fourteen miles from Argostoli, and about 3800 feet above the level of the sea (more than half way up the mountain) he had had arduous and dangerous duties to perform. The burning of large patches of the forest and the cutting down of trees were the constant practices of the peasantry. They were also accustomed to let their flocks of goats regale themselves on all the young trees of the forest; and they regarded as a cruel enemy any one who interfered with this destruction of the public property. But the chief crime of Captain Parker had been the great services which he had rendered to the Government in pursuing the insurgents, after their return from the attack on Argostoli, in September, 1848. Yet the peasantry are not believed to have actually murdered the unfortunate man, though they displayed a shameful indifference, if not joy, at his death.

On the evening of the 8th of May, 1849, Cap-

tain Parker left his hut to walk with his wife down the road (made by Captain Kennedy) which led to Argostoli. At a very romantic spot, in the path on the side of the hill, some large rocks overhang the narrow and wooded road. Concealed behind these rocks, a small party of men discharged their guns at the captain. He fell wounded at the foot of a tree, the trunk of which is still marked by a cross, constantly renewed by the care of the Residents of Cephalonia. His leg had been shot through. His terrified wife fled, and rushed down the hill to save her life; but the murderers took no heed of her, for she was a native of the middle class. They now left their hiding-places, and butchered the wounded Englishman as he lay bleeding on the ground. They then escaped, and left the corpse. When help came, the captain's little dog was found seated by its master's body, moaning sadly; nor till the latter was carried away could it be moved from the spot. The fidelity of the dog made it famous, and it is said that it did not long survive its master. In the English burial-ground at Cephalonia (where a handsome tomb has been raised to the memory of Captain Parker), the dog is represented as faithfully sitting on and guarding its master's final resting-place.*

The murder of Captain Parker was supposed to

* But deprived of its head, from the sacrilegious desecrations in which the Ionian peasantry so frequently indulge in English graveyards.

have been the work of refugees from Greece. It was the prelude to fresh disturbances in Cephalonia; for the peasantry persisted in concealing the assassins, and neither threats nor rewards could induce them to give them up. The political conduct of the Lord High Commissioner, and his very friendly countenance to the extreme Liberals, were calculated to encourage the malcontents. The peasantry began to commit horrible outrages in various parts of the country, when, at a distance from the capital, they thought themselves safe from the interference of the soldiers. Another circumstance increased the agitation in Cephalonia. Lord Seaton had removed Baron d'Everton from that island to the inferior Residency of Santa Maura. He had at first intended to order an investigation into the Baron's conduct. This idea, however, he wisely abandoned on learning that one of the chief evidences to be called against him would give his opinion that Lord Seaton himself was chiefly to blame for the attack on Argostoli in September, 1848. Certainly the absence of all inquiry into that attack and surprise is an incomprehensible fact, if it be not explained by the circumstance just mentioned.

Major Symonds, of the Royal Engineers, was appointed to succeed Baron d'Everton as Resident, though but ill fitted in every way for such a task, and quite ignorant of the language of the people.

He and Colonel Trollope, the commandant, were employed in quieting the island in the summer and autumn of 1849. But when martial law was subsequently proclaimed, the command and responsibility rested entirely with the colonel. The military forces had been greatly increased by repeated reinforcements, and consisted of upwards of seven hundred men. But the events of 1849, after the month of May, belong to the rule of Sir Henry Ward, and will be mentioned in their proper place.

The eighth Parliament, which was opened on the 1st of March, 1845, and lasted till the 26th of March, 1850 (that is, ten months after the arrival of Sir Henry Ward), had changed its character before its close. Elected under the old system, and by a small constituency, it had for the first three years given no trouble; but after Lord Seaton had pronounced himself a radical reformer, it was natural that the Assembly should not lag behind the Protectorate in liberality. It was, therefore, soon inclined to keep pace with, and even to pass, his lordship in the career of rapid changes; and it speedily gave to observant eyes an idea of what future assemblies would be when elected after the reforms had become law. Amongst other things, the Assembly permitted the spectators in the gallery to applaud or disapprove of its proceedings in the most unseemly manner. On the 28th of May,

1849, a few weeks before the arrival of his successor, Lord Seaton felt obliged to send a message of reprimand to the House, adding, that he would refuse to give his approval to any bill which had been exposed to the interruptions of strangers.*

On the 1st of June Lord Seaton was relieved by Sir Henry Ward, and left the Islands in a very unsettled state; having in a few weeks introduced, or prepared the adoption of, reforms exceeding in their democratic tendency those which during the last two centuries have been adopted in Great Britain itself. At the same time the executive was less than ever responsible to the Legislature, and still retained unimpaired the exorbitant powers of the high police. Thus his lordship's changes encouraged without satisfying the advocates of the Union, whilst he filled with consternation and despair all the true friends of the Protectorate. It is astonishing that it never occurred to him that he was paving the way for the cessation of the Protectorate and for the union of the Islands with Greece. He did not foresee that if numbers were in future to rule public opinion, without reference to intelligence or wealth, all rational government would be obstructed. Above all, he did not perceive that the great mass of the Ionians cared little for reforms, and desired only the Union. Yet he might have suspected that a people

* Parliamentary papers.

who were so apparently indifferent to the exercise of the despotic high police powers could not really care much for liberty as understood by Englishmen. Half-civilized nations, hampered by bigoted creeds that effect their policy, are rarely enamoured with liberty any more than with toleration. Orthodoxy and nationality are the objects of their enthusiasm. Such have ever been hitherto the two levers by which the Ionian demagogues raised the passions of the people and acquired their affections. The tyranny of the high police was favourable to politicians devoid of the respectability attached to property and character. It made them heroes and martyrs on easy terms. A witty Cephalonian has observed that the fortune of a rizospast* was made when the high police knocked at his door. From that moment he became a favourite candidate for the salaried posts which were given by the people, such as memberships of parliament and municipal offices.† After this it frequently became the object of the Lord High Commissioners to gain these favourites of the mob, who consequently sometimes reached the highest offices, becoming secretaries, senators, and presidents of the Assembly.

In conclusion, Lord Seaton paved the way for the Union by rendering impossible, for any useful purpose, the continuance of the Protectorate, unless,

* Rizospast is the Greek word for a radical.
† Lascarato's *Mysteries of Cephalonia.*

indeed, the prosperity and progress of the Islands were to be entirely sacrificed by Great Britain, to the selfish advantage of retaining so valuable a fortress and so good a naval position as Corfu. The Unionists had neither the physical nor the moral force to carry out their designs unaided by the Government. But the constitution of Lord Seaton, while it left them nearly helpless for any good purpose, furnished them with very great powers of obstruction. These enabled the Assemblies to impede for the future all those material improvements, which, with the maintenance of order, and the preservation of life and property, were the only advantages which could be attributed to the protection of Great Britain. It will now be evident to the reader why the Ionian Liberals—that is, the Ionians generally—cherish with enthusiastic affection the memory of Lord Seaton; and also why the Protectionists, whether Ionian or English, have always severely condemned his conduct.

Personally, the gallant and noble lord was exceedingly popular with all who came in contact with him. His high character, distinguished name, noble appearance, and affable manners, could not but make a favourable impression. At times he carried his love of popularity too far, as, when descending from his high station, he mixed himself up with party politics, and accepted in 1849, in times of excitement, an invitation to a banquet from the literary society

of Corfu, which had transformed itself into a political club.* With less justice he has been condemned for issuing his invitations to the Ionian gentry in modern Greek, a language too much neglected by all the Lord High Commissioners and their Residents throughout the duration of the British Protectorate. Not the least of the benefits conferred on the Ionians by Lord Seaton was the effect of the high character and unimpeachable private conduct of his lordship and his amiable family during their stay in the Islands. As regards his finances, he, like his predecessor, on the average exceeded his income. By January, 1858, the national debt had been augmented to 216,000*l.*,† a portion of which was made up of the arrears due to the Protectorate.‡ This payment to Great Britain, limited in Lord Nugent's time to 34,000*l.* a year, was in 1849 further reduced to 25,000*l.*, and so continued up to the cession of the Islands.

With a great and deserved reputation as a warrior, who had earned before his death a peerage and the baton of a field-marshal, Lord Seaton, nevertheless, amply proved that a brave and skilful

* Count Dusmani (Secretary to Government), so long the faithful and able servant of the Protectorate, strongly urged Lord Seaton to accept the invitation. From a protectionist point of view I think he erred, but at least it showed a readiness to favour reforms instituted by the Protectorate, as were those of Lord Seaton.

† Vide Appendix C.

‡ Arrears of contribution due in 1849, 67,227*l.* 1s. 8d.—*Parliamentary Return.*

general may be very far from being a wise and prudent statesman.

Lord Seaton's great innovations emanated from the Government, and not from the people: for the eighth Parliament, on which he imposed the reforms which it had not originated, was not a free Assembly, but was selected according to the old system of the constitution of 1817. His lordship, it is said, had been led to believe that by granting great reforms not only would England become popular in the Ionian Islands, but that she would thereby acquire absolute preponderance in the East. With reference to one part of his expectations, he was certainly grossly deceived; but with regard to the other, it may still be a question whether England has not gained more moral force by the voluntary cession which she has made, than she has lost of physical power by the surrender of the great fortress of Corfu.

CHAPTER VII.

SIR HENRY WARD, SEVENTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1849 TO 1855.]

Difficulties of Sir H. Ward—Cautions the Assembly—Ingratitude of latter to Lord Seaton—First Assembly of Sir Henry—Fresh Revolt in Cephalonia—Nodaro, Vlaco, Colonel Trollope—His Measures—Sir H. Ward in Cephalonia—Second Amnesty—Reforms—Ninth Parliament—Disputes about the Oath — Compromise effected — Modified Oath established — Count Caruso—Character of new Assembly—Neglect of Commerce by the Protection—Imprudent Speech of the Lord High Commissioner—Electors and Members of Assembly banished—Deficiency of Revenue—Tenth Parliament twice Prorogued—Sir H. Ward's attempted Reductions—The most Democratic Assembly—The Great Characteristic of Englishmen.

SIR HENRY WARD arrived at Corfu on the 2nd of June, 1849, and received over from Lord Seaton's hands the Government of the Islands. Thus, a Conservative military peer was succeeded by a civilian member of the most advanced liberal party in the House of Commons. Such an appointment was hailed with joyful anticipations by the Ionian Liberals. They naturally thought that if a Tory nobleman had done so much for them, a Radical commoner would be sure to concede to

them all their wishes. In this expectation they were doomed to be grievously disappointed. The new Lord High Commissioner began his task under every disadvantage. His predecessor had granted, at parting, such great and sudden concessions as left little room for the display of liberality. On the contrary, his Excellency had scarcely arrived when he deemed it necessary to assume a conservative attitude. Starting from a constitution of merely nominal freedom, a wild democracy was rapidly rising in the form of a single Legislative Assembly. Sir Henry Ward found that some extreme measures, which he had long and vainly advocated in England, were already granted or promised to the Ionian people. Even the reformed English Parliament had refused to introduce the vote by ballot, or very extended suffrage. Yet, a community of half-civilized Greeks was, as it were in a moment, given privileges which were considered too dangerous even for the enlightened inhabitants of Great Britain. No wonder, then, if the able, though Radical, statesman (influenced by the responsibility of office, and by his high position as the Queen's representative) became alarmed at the prospect before him. He had to deal with a people naturally excitable, whose passions had been aroused and encouraged by his predecessor; and he had all the difficulty and risk of carrying out

very extensive political changes without enjoying the credit and popularity of having originated them. Even Lord Seaton, before his departure, had acknowledged the necessity of moderating the ardor of a Parliament which was not composed of the freely-elected representatives of the people. What, then, was to be expected from the next Assembly, the offspring of vote by ballot and of a more than three-fold augmented constituency? In 1849 a secret society, called "The Great Brotherhood," was discovered in Corfu, in connexion with the head society at Athens. But secret societies had ever been common amongst all Greeks; and the Protectorate was too powerful to justify any alarm at such proceedings.

On the 4th of June, a few days after his arrival, Sir Henry Ward cautioned, even whilst he congratulated, the Assembly in regard to the changes about to receive the sanction of her Majesty. He hoped that they would be considered as final, and not as a stepping-stone to further innovations. He even insinuated doubts as to the prudence of some of them. His Excellency was well received on this his first appearance before the Assembly. After a suitable reply from its President, the sitting was closed amidst loud cheers for her Majesty the Queen, both from the members and from the spectators in the galleries.

The very next day, however, the Chamber took

up so hostile an attitude that the Lord High Commissioner prorogued it, by message, until the 5th of October following. A debate was to have been held in the Assembly, to discuss the conduct of Lord Seaton in having exercised the powers of the high police, by the summary banishment of two opposition newspaper editors. A petition, signed by many hundreds of persons, was also to have been presented, complaining of the Roman Catholic Archbishop, Dr. Nicholson's, encroaching proceedings, which excited the jealousy and animosity of the Greek clergy. The conduct of the Assembly, as regarded Lord Seaton, appears, at first sight, very ungrateful. But the inconsistency of that nobleman in retaining such despotic powers in his own hands, after granting to the Ionians the most ultra-democratic reforms, is far more remarkable than the ingratitude of the Assembly. The effects of the freedom of the press were visible soon after the arrival of Sir Henry Ward, in the open advocacy of the union with Greece, as the right no less than the desire of the Ionian people.

Having been relieved for a time of his unruly Legislature, his Excellency proceeded on his tour through the Seven Islands. Everywhere he received multitudes of visits and proffers of advice. It is probable that it was chiefly the class of officials who waited on him. His informants persuaded him that no real desire of union with

Greece existed, especially under King Otho. At Cephalonia he found everything apparently tranquil during his stay. But, before his arrival the troops had been marched about the country, and also detached in villages, in order to levy a contribution (fixed by Lord Seaton) on the peasantry who had been concerned in the September revolt.* Sir Henry Ward, on the 9th of June, informed Earl Grey that, in spite of all precautions, some fresh disturbances might possibly break out. Nevertheless, on the 1st of August, he proclaimed an amnesty in favour of those who had been concerned in the insurrection of the 26th of September, 1848. At the same time he released from banishment Signors Zervo and Livada, whom Lord Seaton had banished in virtue of his high police powers. This amnesty was generally interpreted by the peasantry as a mark of fear in the English Government.

The murder of Captain Parker, in May, 1849, and the behaviour of the peasantry on that occasion, and their subsequent lawless proceedings, were proofs that the mild measures which Lord Seaton adopted for suppressing the revolt of the previous September had been misinterpreted.† It

* On the 3rd of June, 1849, Major Symonds, the Resident, reported his suspicions that the Municipal Council of Cephalonia favoured the ruffians that were tramping through the villages exciting discontents, and committing outrages.

† A few days before Sir Henry Ward's arrival, the Resident's Cottage in the Black Mountain had been burned by a band of assassins. The forest also in the mountain was frequently set on fire, and many trees were destroyed.

was to be feared that the amnesty would only encourage fresh outbreaks. These apprehensions soon proved to be but too well founded.

On the 26th of August the peasantry again broke out into revolt in different parts of Cephalonia. As a general rule, they avoided contact with the troops; but, dispersed in bands, they committed outrages on the property and persons of the Signori and their families. Such of these as were in the country saved themselves by taking refuge in the towns, where they, moreover, habitually lived. But some savage murders were committed. Count Metaxa, after being severely wounded, was burnt alive by the peasantry; and many country mansions of the gentry were fired, and persons murdered or outraged. An infamous priest, named Nodaro, called by the peasantry *Father Thief*, and a man named Vlaco, were the principal ringleaders of the revolt. Great part of the country was in a rebellious state; but the chief instigators, not choosing to risk their own lives by taking an active part, the peasantry were left to carry on warlike operations in a desultory manner.

Colonel Trollope, Commandant of Cephalonia, in order to reduce the country to tranquillity, divided his force into detachments. The Convent of San Gerasimo, romantically situated at the foot of the Black Mountain, formed the head-quarters of one party. Fort George held another. Other

good positions near the mountain were also taken up. In Lixuri and its neighbourhood martial law was proclaimed in four districts. In Scala, where revolting atrocities had been committed, Major King, with eight officers and more than a hundred and fifty non-commissioned officers and soldiers, was quartered. Nearly five hundred soldiers were employed on detachments; whilst Colonel Trollope had a strong reserve in Argostoli. Major King attacked and scattered, after a short resistance, one body of rebels. Desultory and brief conflicts occurred in other parts of the island. To chase the rebels, and to intimidate or to impose fines upon the villages, were the usual tactics. Major King and other officers of the 36th, 16th, and 76th Regiments were, for many weeks, employed in a very harassing service, in which no honor could be gained. There were occasionally momentary collisions between the military and the peasantry; but the latter seldom attempted any effectual resistance. Martial law having been proclaimed by the Lord High Commissioner, Colonel Trollope assumed the entire authority; Major Symonds, the Resident, being for the time deprived of all right of interference.

Sir Henry Ward arrived at Cephalonia on the 2nd of September, and, unfortunately, began by taking an active personal part in the suppression of the revolt. His Excellency, on the following

day, accompanied Captain Nugent and a company of the 36th Regiment to the village of Trojanata. There he desired the Primate (or chief peasant) of the village to ring the church bell, in order to assemble the people, to hear his proclamation read. At this moment a shot was fired by some concealed insurgent, which killed the Primate, who fell at the feet of his Excellency. Shots were then fired from the houses at the troops. The latter returned the fire, and advanced to attack with the bayonet; upon which the rebels fled, and the soldiers pursued and made some prisoners.

From this period Sir Henry abstained from active service in the field,* and left to Colonel Trollope the task of putting down the revolt and restoring quiet. This was not completed till near the close of October, after many severe examples had been made. Altogether, during the revolt, twenty-one persons were executed by sentence of courts-martial. In all sixty-eight courts-martial were assembled. Great numbers of peasants were flogged; but, as the lash (however undesirable a punishment) was usually the substitute for death, it can scarcely be condemned on the score of humanity. The principal assassins, Nodaro and Vlaco, were taken and executed about the middle of October, 1849; and from that time the rebellion may be said to have been crushed. It had

* I say *abstained* because he evidently had a taste for active employment.

extended, between 1848 and 1849, over a great part of the Island; and had lasted, on the second occasion, for nearly three months.

The following year, in consequence of the unwearied exertions of Signor Papanicolas, an attempt was made by a small section of English Liberals to obtain from the British Parliament a condemnation of the mode in which Sir Henry Ward had suppressed the revolt. The motion of Mr. Hume, on the 11th of August, 1850, was, however, supported only by 13 votes in the House of Commons. It was, indeed, a small House, only 84 members being present on the occasion. But, it may be presumed that those who were against Sir Henry did not fail to attend; whilst the great majority in his favour may have thought it needless to be present. Earl Grey, in the House of Lords, and Lord John Russell, in the Commons, manfully defended the Lord High Commissioner against all attacks.* The only result of this move against the latter was to obtain the indirect sanction of Parliament for the measures which his Excellency had adopted. Assuredly, if a revolt is to be suppressed at all, the more speedily and decisively it is done the better. The attempted rebellion under Lord Seaton had been followed by a fresh outbreak in the succeeding year. But the

* Signor Papanicolas, by his violence and gross exaggeration, ruined the cause which he advocated, and was probably chiefly to blame for the smallness of the minority.

revolt crushed by Sir Henry Ward was never afterwards imitated. From that time forth the Cephalonians have been as peaceful and as orderly as any other islanders (although constantly in opposition to the protecting Government), whilst perfect tranquillity has been maintained in the other six islands.

In October, 1849, a new amnesty was proclaimed, and Sir Henry Ward returned to his task of arranging with Earl Grey the details of the political changes broached by his predecessor. Lord Seaton had proposed to make the Lord High Commissioner, conjointly with the Senate, responsible to the Assembly for any acts passed by them during the recess. But Earl Grey had not sanctioned such a suicidal proposition. Nor would the Colonial Minister consent to leave to the caprice of the future democratic Assembly the fixing of the amount to be paid to the Protectorate, in accordance with the Treaty of Paris. This sum was, therefore, fixed in the old Parliament at 25,000*l.* a year. Moreover, the English civil list was in future to be 13,000*l.* instead of 15,000*l.* a year. Even this reduced amount was too great a burden on the revenue; and the national debt continued to increase.

Sir Henry Ward received valuable assistance at the commencement of his government from the

appointment of Mr., afterwards Sir George, Bowen to be Secretary. Mr. Bowen had been Rector of the University of Corfu, and the Duke of Newcastle selected him for his new post mainly in consequence of his knowledge of modern Greek. His was the solitary case in the history of the British Protectorate of such knowledge becoming useful to its possessor or to the country.

The eighth Parliament having run the usual course, expired; and on the 20th of March, 1850, the ninth (the first reformed) Parliament was opened by Sir Henry Ward.* The President, elected by the Assembly, Count Roma, was duly confirmed by the Lord High Commissioner. As might have been expected, the new Assembly was in almost unanimous opposition to the Government. His Excellency himself could hardly have expected any other result.† In Cephalonia especially, where, in both revolts, the criminals of the upper classes had been screened and saved from

* It appears that the insolent practice of admitting a priest to purify the House after the departure of the Lord High Commissioner commenced with the ninth Parliament, which was the first also to proclaim in a body its "*will*" for the union with Greece.

† The official condemnation of Lord Seaton's changes was delayed for ten years after their introduction. It required the failure of Mr. Gladstone's mission to open completely the eyes of Ministers on the subject. But it came with force from a Philhellene like Sir E. B. Lytton, who, on the 21st of February, 1859, thus wrote to Mr. Gladstone: "The reforms of 1849 have proved in their operations signally defective. Both Sir Henry Ward and Sir John Young expressed their belief that the harmony of the legislative and executive bodies, and the satisfactory working of the new constitution, were impossible. The results have become apparent, in the neglect of many of the public works, the embarrassment of the finances, the obstruction to sound legislative and administrative reforms."

punishment, all the members returned were of the ultra-radical party. Some of them were men without characters; many were without property. Amongst the most respectable of them was the repeatedly-banished Signor Zervo, a man who had raised himself by his eloquence, and by the strength of his opinions, from the class of peasant farmers.

The Assembly having met, elected as its provisional President, its oldest member, the Chevalier Valaoriti. The greater portion of the members had never sat before, and were entirely new to business. The first difficulty was in regard to the taking of the usual oath by the members, and till the latter were sworn, the formation of the Senate could not be proceeded with by the Lord High Commissioner. The old oath, established in 1818, and ever since taken by every Parliament, had not the sanction of any actual law, and was not a part of the constitution. Of this circumstance the new Assembly desired to take advantage, by itself regulating the oath to be taken by its members. The main object was to omit the word "indissoluble" as regarded the bonds established between the Islands and the Protectorate. The Chevalier Mustoxidi, and Dr. Zambelli, formed part of a deputation sent to confer with the Lord High Commissioner on the subject. They explained the scruples of the Assembly as having no reference to the present circumstances, but as being a "sort of religious

faith," that at some distant period, the whole Greek race would be reunited into one empire. In such a case the Ionians could not reasonably be required to regard as "indissoluble" their connexion with any other power. The matter continued to be contested between the Assembly and the Commissioner by messages and replies. The Assembly declared that the terms of every oath ought to be so framed as to enable the representatives of the people to bring them into harmony with their own sense of the duties, which they were called upon to discharge. It desired to limit the oath to a promise to obey the laws, and to defend the rights and interests of the Ionian people. It wished to omit all allusion, not only to the Treaty of Paris, and to the constitution of 1817, but even to the Protectorate itself. Eventually, the House agreed to a compromise, not from any loyal or friendly feeling, but from a fear, that if they held out, anarchy would prevail; which could only serve to restore to the Protectorate its full despotic powers. Some of the extreme demagogues, without principle, or stake in the country, were willing to go all lengths; but the majority saw the necessity of a compromise. Eventually, the Lord High Commissioner carried by a great majority a modified oath. The word "indissoluble" was given up by his Excellency, and so was the detested constitution of 1817. But the Treaty of Paris, and the rights of the Protecting Sovereign were maintained by the oath,

now legally established.* A protest was made against this oath, signed by five members—four Cephalonians, and one Ithacan. The names of Messrs. Zervo and Livada, the violent enemies of the Protectorate, were amongst the former signatures.

Sir Henry Ward now endeavoured to obtain the assistance of this unpromising Assembly in various useful and necessary measures. There were abuses to be remedied in the administration of Church property; and it was desirable to elevate the condition of the working clergy, and to provide salaries for them out of the public revenue. He called the attention of the House also to the canal at Santa Maura, which had already cost upwards of 22,000*l.*, and could be completed for a little more than 10,000*l.* He doubted the wisdom of the original undertaking, but thought it worth a moderate sacrifice, not to lose the fruit of the money and labour already expended. He believed that vessels would naturally prefer the short and sheltered passage to encountering the heavy seas that beat upon the outer coasts.

In the usual change of offices that took place at the opening of the ninth Parliament, Count Caruso was appointed Regent of Cephalonia.† He proved

* *Form of the new oath.*—"I hereby solemnly swear to do my duty faithfully, as one of the representatives of the Ionian people; to obey all existing laws, and to respect and maintain the constitutional rights of the Protecting Sovereign, derived from the relations established in virtue of the Treaty of Paris, between the protecting and protected States."

† He was reappointed at the opening of the tenth Parliament. Regents

himself to be a devoted, but very unscrupulous partisan of the Protectorate; the unpopularity of which he, by his conduct, very greatly contributed to increase. He had the credit of having urged Sir Henry to deal with the rebels in 1849 even more severely than was actually done. But he prepared his future elevation to high office by establishing the character of a man, ready to perform anything that was required of him by the distributors of power and patronage.

Sir Henry Ward (like Lord Seaton) found it necessary to lecture the Assembly on the disgraceful manner in which the debates were carried on, amidst the interruptions of the gallery. But he might have spared his pains, both as regarded his admonitions and his plans for material amendments. The Assembly, which was elected in consequence of the rash innovations of Lord Seaton, was animated solely by hatred of the British Protectorate, and of the local Government. It presented, through its President, Count Roma, a most insolent reply to the Lord High Commissioner. It censured the conduct of Great Britain towards Greece; *as if the latter had been the model of good government.** It deplored, not the murders, out-

when unscrupulous, had great powers for facilitating or impeding the verification of claims to the franchise.

* This alluded to Admiral Parker's blockade of the Piræus, to enforce the claims of M. Pacifico, Mr. Finlay, and others, after years of fruitless correspondence, in which the audacity of the Greek Ministers, in persisting in unfounded statements and assertions, is a matter of astonishment to all who have waded through the prolix details of that affair.

rages, and repeated burnings which had disgraced the late revolts, but, only the harsh measures by which they had been suppressed. It attributed to the Protectorate the decay of commerce, and of agriculture, and all the accidents of nature and of fortune. It demanded radical reforms, as if the changes which had just been introduced were of a trifling description.

His Excellency replied to the Assembly on the 13th of April. He reminded them how entirely spontaneous had been the concessions of the Protectorate to the Ionians. He defended the conduct of his predecessors, declaring that it had been necessary for the Ionians to pass an apprenticeship in the school of that liberty for which he was still of opinion that thirty years before they had been quite unfit. He explained that the revival of the carrying trade by Greece, and the growth of the Austrian and Sardinian mercantile navies, had caused the decay of commerce; and that this evil did not arise from any fault of the Protectorate. But here, I think, his reasoning was weak, as he did not attempt to prove that the Protecting Power had done all that she could do, to counterbalance the exertions of Austria and of Sardinia. Indeed, some Englishmen have been of opinion that much more might have been done for the commerce and traffic of the Islands than has ever been attempted.*

* *The Ionian Islands in Relation to Greece*, 1859. By John Dunn Gardner.

His Excellency defended his conduct at Cephalonia, and also his use of the high police powers. He had found four persons banished by Lord Seaton, two to Paxo, and two to Cerigo. He had released them all. Two of them were members of the present Assembly. He had also released at Cephalonia nine prisoners awaiting trial for the attack of September 1848, on the towns of Argostoli and Lixuri. He had issued two amnesties since his arrival in the Islands; and he had expressed to the English Minister at Athens, his readiness to receive back Ionian refugees. He acknowledged that he had three times during the revolt used the powers of the high police, which his predecessors had often employed in times of perfect tranquillity.

It was in the same speech that Sir Henry Ward introduced the following observation, which was by no means calculated to lessen the difficulties of his trying position: "It is not for me to speak in the name of the British Crown of that distant future, which the address shadows forth, when the scattered members of the Greek race may be reunited in one mighty empire with the consent of the European Powers. But I have no difficulty in expressing my own opinion, that if such an event be within the scope of human contingencies, the Sovereign and the Parliament of England would be equally willing to see the Ionians resume their

place as members of the new power that would then take its part in the policy of the world." Such remarks were calculated to increase the agitation of the union question in the already greatly excited country.

With regard to the demand for radical reforms, Sir Henry recommended the longer trial of a constitution only a few weeks old; but such a demand proved, if proof were necessary, how short-sighted had been the predictions of Lord Seaton, that the amplitude of his concessions would ensure a contented Assembly, well disposed to work amicably with the Protectorate.

The Assembly passed a bill to abolish the high police powers, but it was returned so changed by the Senate, that the House rejected it altogether. But it cannot be doubted that, in the hope of thereby establishing the Union, many of the members endeavoured to render impossible all government by the Protectorate. As the Assembly persisted in attacking the conduct of the Lord High Commissioner, he prorogued it for six months. In the mean time, he again exercised the powers of the high police in banishing editors of papers, and even four members of Parliament—a violent act of despotism it must be confessed. The Colonial Minister, it is true, denounced some of these victims as the authors of "most gross and disgusting libels;" but the only excuse for not sending these men to trial

was that Ionian juries would have been certain to acquit them, and yet it was precisely for political offences that Lord Seaton had so confidently introduced trial by jury.

Excepting that no improvements entailing fresh expenses could be introduced, the executive Government, supported by the naval and military power of Great Britain, continued its regular course with perfect tranquillity in the absence of the Assembly. The latter had found an annual deficiency of 19,000*l.* in a yearly revenue of 156,000*l.* It had proposed to remedy this evil by cutting down all the salaries of officials by one-half. But the prorogation of the Assembly left the decision in the hands of the Senate, that is, of the Lord High Commissioner, and the salaries were not reduced, but some of the works were stopped.* Sir Henry Ward feared, no doubt, to weaken the already diminished protectionist party by ill-timed reductions of official salaries; but by this measure the Assembly was, of course, deprived of that which in all constitutional countries is considered the undoubted right of the representatives of the people. Their discontent, therefore, was only natural, however factious might be the real motives of many of the democratic members. The ninth Parliament was finally dissolved (on the recom-

* Papanicolas.

mendation of the Lord High Commissioner) on the 22nd of September, 1851, by order of the Queen in Council.

Sir Henry Ward before the assembling of the tenth Parliament, laboured hard to create a party of reformers, who, deferring all aspirations for the Union, should dedicate themselves to material progress, and to economical and judicial reforms. In this plan, he was for a time flattered with hopes of success, but was destined finally to be bitterly disappointed.

The tenth Parliament opened on the 22nd of February, 1852. Hitherto, the Lord High Commissioners had read their speeches in Italian, but from this time forward they were always delivered in English, and were then read in Greek by the Secretary of the Assembly. The present Parliament was as untractable as its predecessor had been, frequently proposing unconstitutional motions. On the 17th of March it was prorogued for six months; but it was again reassembled on the 12th of June, from a belief that it had in the interim become more reasonable. It, however, finally rejected the proposed reforms, and the session terminated in much confusion and discord.

As the Parliament during its existence ordinarily met only once in two years, there was now again a comparative calm; the war being carried on in the

press in the Greek language, which had almost entirely superseded the Italian.

On the 1st of March, 1854, the second regular session of the tenth Parliament began, but the result was only another prorogation, within three weeks of the opening.* Another meeting and another prorogation followed in the course of the year. Finally, Sir Henry Ward was relieved of his government, by the arrival of his successor, Sir John Young, on the 13th of April, 1855.

In his last endeavours at reform, the Lord High Commissioner had desired to reduce all the salaries of the officials, including the members of the Assembly. He had even set the example himself, by giving up 500*l.* a year out of the 5000*l.* which constituted his yearly salary. But in consequence of his reforms having been rejected, he after the lapse of a few months resumed his full salary, which remained the same up to the cession of the Islands.

Sir Henry left to his successor a tranquil but discontented population. The great majority of the landed gentry were attached to the British Protectorate, and terrified at the idea of an union with highly-taxed, badly-governed, and impoverished Greece; but the reforms of Lord Seaton,

* Soon after the meeting of the Parliament, at its second session, the *Philalethes*, the leading newspaper of Corfu, suspended its issue in consequence of the threats of the employment of the high police. Messrs. Mustoxidi, Polila, and Zambelli were concerned in this opposition publication.

which his successor had been compelled to carry out, had placed the Assembly in the hands of a violent opposition. Most of the members, poor and depending on their salaries, were pledged to their constituents to be satisfied with nothing less than the Union. They did not generally obtain credit for sincerity, because it was supposed that the granting of their demands must necessarily lead to the exclusion of the great majority of them from all political employment. For when the Islands should cease to form an independent state, all the machinery of Government would of course be greatly curtailed. But amongst the Liberals, there were many worthy persons actuated by patriotism and love of nationality, though of course not untinged with that ambition which is everywhere natural to men. It is certain that the Ionian Parliament had become, under the monarchical and aristocratical protection of Great Britain, one of the most democratic assemblies in the world, so far as concerned the personal character and position of its members. But it possessed none of the physical or moral means by which a popular assembly can hope to force upon a Government the adoption of its own measures.

Personally, Sir Henry Ward was highly respected by both English and Ionians. He imparted a good

tone to Ionian society, as Lord Seaton and Sir Howard Douglas had previously done; exhibiting that bright example of domestic life, which, in spite of exceptions, is allowed by all intelligent foreigners to be the great characteristic of Englishmen.

CHAPTER VIII.

SIR JOHN YOUNG, BART., EIGHTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[FROM MARCH, 1855, TO JANUARY, 1859.]

State of the Assembly—Want of influence of the Protectorate—State of Municipalities—Petition to colonize Corfu—Resolution for Union with Greece—Bread refused to Turks—Procession of Saint Spiridion—Insult to the Lord High Commissioner—The latter unsupported by the Colonial Minister—Mr. Gladstone's Mission — Famous Despatch Robbery — Arrival of the High Commissioner Extraordinary—Mr. Gladstone's Speech to the Senate — Visits Santa Maura and Cephalonia — Mistakes the Opinions of the Cephalonians — Visits Zante — Mr. Gladstone's unfortunate Diplomacy — Declines to receive certain Petitions — Deceived at Athens — Corfu Journal in the Pay of Otho—Episcopal Contretemps at Paxo—How the desire for Union arose at Paxo—Sir John Young recalled — Praised by Mr. Gladstone.

SIR JOHN YOUNG commenced his duties as Lord High Commissioner on the 13th of April, 1855. The ignorance, or bad faith, of those Ionian writers who pretended that the opposition of the Assembly to Sir Henry Ward was to be attributed to the cruelty of the latter towards the insurgent Cephalonians, was now fully exposed. A more mild and gentle ruler than Sir John Young can hardly be

conceived, yet the Assembly treated him in the same hostile manner as it had treated his predecessor. The great majority of the landed proprietors were still in favour of the Protectorate; but the reforms of Lord Seaton had deprived them of nearly all power. The demagogues, with the priests and the people, were, or affected to be, anxious for a speedy union with Greece, then under the imbecile sway of King Otho; and occupied militarily by the allied powers, in consequence of its Russian sympathies during the Crimean war. The peasantry were become the uncompromising enemies of that Protectorate which had first relieved them from the tyranny of the nobles, and then given them a political power and importance wholly unsuited to their state of civilization. The Assembly not only set the Protectorate at defiance, but neglected at its meetings the forms of order and decency. The mob in the galleries of the House became more than ever unruly; often interrupting, and even taking part in the debates. The galleries were able to contain about nine hundred men; and were usually filled with the lowest rabble of Corfu.

Like his predecessor, Sir John Young was compelled to have frequent recourse to prorogations, to put a stop to treasonable motions. In the absence of the Assembly, affairs proceeded smoothly under the Lord High Commissioner and Senate in

matters regarding the general government. But the municipalities, by intrigues and obstructions, supplied the place of the Assembly when not sitting, and constantly gave great trouble.

The tenth Parliament, repeatedly prorogued, was finally dissolved on the 28th of November, 1856. The Government took no part in the elections of the eleventh Parliament; probably in consequence of the failure of Sir Henry Ward to obtain the election of sincere reformers for the preceding Assembly. In Great Britain there is always some advantage derived from the elections by the party in office, which is generally considered as the legitimate influence of the Government. But Sir Henry had proved that Lord Seaton's reforms had almost entirely destroyed at elections the influence of the Protectorate. On the other hand, it must be confessed that no party can come even temporarily into office at home, without possessing some strength in the country. Whereas in the Ionian Islands, the ministers (that is the Senate) were always the creatures of the Lord High Commissioner, and totally independent of the Assembly. But, on the other hand, the new municipalities acquired a great deal of the power which formerly was in fact exercised by the general Government. The municipal officers, elected by a free constituency, were very much inclined to stretch their power beyond the legal limits, extensive as these were.

They were also disposed to sacrifice, for their relations and friends, the interests of the Government, and to wink at serious offences. Thus, under their charge, the roads were left unrepaired, and the marshes undrained; and the revenues of the convents were misappropriated. In Cephalonia the fine forest in the Black Mountain suffered continual loss from fire, and from the secret cutting down of trees. The municipal officers feared to lose votes if they interfered to punish the peasantry. In short, many of the worst evils of an unbridled democracy had a free course under the Protectorate of the British Monarchy. But if the municipalities gave much trouble, the Assembly gave still more.

The eleventh Parliament met on the 16th of February, under the provisional presidency of Signor Dandolo. This gentleman, not devoid of ability, and popular, not only with his countrymen but with many of the English, was unfortunately extremely deficient in political consistency. Such a choice reflected but little credit on the wisdom of the Assembly, and the subsequent conduct of the latter was in keeping with the commencement. The verifying of the election caused the most violent discussions. It was attempted to prove that the elections of Cephalonia had been illegally conducted. It was necessary to prorogue the House till the opinions of the Crown lawyers could be

consulted in England, where it was finally decided that the elections were perfectly legal.

On the 20th of May, 1857, the Lord High Commissioner opened the Parliament. On the 20th of June an important discussion took place, occasioned by a report that a memorial had been circulated for signatures, praying that Corfu might be declared a colony of the British Crown. In spite of the assertion of the Judge Advocate Fiscal, on the part of the Government, that there was no truth in the report, the House appointed a committee to inquire into the circumstances. Messrs. Lombardo, Padovan, and Dandolo took part in the debates. The House unanimously declared itself firmly opposed to all ideas of colonization, and it also passed a resolution in favour of immediate union with Greece. The session closed on the 3rd of August, 1857.

The municipality of Corfu was destined to gain a victory over Sir John Young, which was the first step to his public humiliation and final recall. In the autumn of 1858, some Turkish vessels, passing along the coast with troops, entered the harbour of Corfu to take in coals and other supplies. Some of their sailors had purchased bread, and were about to start to return to their ships, when the municipal officer who had charge of the market ordered the bread to be taken by the police from the Turkish boats. The false plea of

scarcity was afterwards offered as an excuse for the act, which, as affecting a foreign nation, the ally of Great Britain, could not be legal without the sanction of the general Government. The seventh article of the Treaty of Paris, moreover, had expressly placed all the ports under British protection. The Turks, in fact, would not have surrendered the bread had it not been demanded by the Lord High Commissioner's police.* His Excellency, therefore, through the Senate, reprimanded Count Trivoli, the municipal officer, who had been actuated by the desire to acquire a wretched popularity at the expense of the detested Turks. Count Trivoli revenged himself by an address to the people, highly insulting to the Government, and especially to the Lord High Commissioner. Joined by the other municipal officers, he presented also a protest on the subject to Sir John Young. The latter referred the whole matter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Soon after the affair of the Turks, occurred one of the triennial processions of Saint Spiridion, the patron saint of Corfu. Those processions were grand affairs, in which the earlier Lord High Commissioners were wont to march bareheaded, and in which the garrison as well as civilians took a part. But of late years the attendance of the military had been dispensed with. Even the Lord

* Parliamentary papers.

High Commissioner now merely showed himself for a few minutes in the balcony of the palace, as the passing procession halted beneath it and offered up a prayer for the Queen.

When, on the 23rd of August, 1858, the procession halted, as usual, before the palace, the Municipal Council separated themselves from the rest; rejoining the procession, when this had moved again, after the Archbishop's prayer. This was an unmistakable act of petty vengeance. But the municipal officers afterwards brought forward in their defence an imaginary slight offered to their religion by Sir John Young. His Excellency's *aides-de-camp*, being on leave, had not appeared in uniform in the balcony. The Lord High Commissioner was supported, therefore, only by his assistant secretary. The absurdity of the excuse deceived nobody in Corfu. The whole proceeding was an act of defiance, in keeping with the general behaviour of the public functionaries, ever since the reforms of Lord Seaton had become law. Again the matter, after much correspondence, was referred to the Colonial Minister, with a suggestion that the culprits should be suspended from office.* Sir John Young, and his able secretary, Sir George Bowen, of course expected full support from home. If the Protectorate were to be maintained (as every ministry still declared to be

* Parliamentary papers.

the intention of Great Britain), it was surely necessary to support the local Government, especially when manifestly in the right.

The Colonial Minister replied in a despatch, dated the 1st of November, 1858. He disapproved, of course, of the conduct of Count Trivoli, in the matter of the bread taken out of the Turkish boats. But he did so coldly, recommending conciliation, and even taking exceptions to some of the correspondence on the part of the Government. In the matter of the insult to the representative of the British Crown, the Colonial Minister's sympathies were all with the municipalities. He thought it the wisest course to see in the conduct of the latter (who were merely carrying on the squabble commenced about the bread), no other motive than the one they had chosen to avow. He gravely cautioned the Lord High Commissioner on "the inadvertence" which he had committed by suffering his youthful *aides-de-camp* to absent themselves on the occasion of the procession, and he again advised conciliation. The despatch then proceeded to announce the appointment, as Special Commissioner, of Mr. Gladstone, "whose renown as a Homeric scholar, will justly commend him to the sympathies of an Hellenic race." Sir John Young, finally, was requested to give that distinguished statesman every support in the performance of his duty.*

* arliamentary papers.

The Lord High Commissioner, although restrained, both by official decorum and by natural gentleness, yet bitterly felt the want of confidence in himself too evidently displayed. He must have perceived, indeed, from that moment, that his continuance in his post could no longer redound either to his own credit, or to the cause of the Protectorate. He did not, however, resign. But he asked for clearer proofs of the opinions and of the intentions of the minister, as regarded himself and his policy. He was enabled at the same time to affirm, that during the three years and a half in which he had held office, "the powers of the high police had not been resorted to in a single instance. There is not," he added, "an Ionian in exile or in confinement by any kind of legal process for political offences." He declared the commerce of the States to be yearly increasing; and he terminated by challenging a comparison with his predecessors in regard to the results of his government.*

On the 9th of November, 1858, Sir John Young announced to the Ionians the intended mission of Mr. Gladstone. It naturally created a great sensation in the Islands; and coupled with the treatment which the Lord High Commissioner had received, it powerfully excited the hopes of the Unionists.

The discussions concerning the procession of Saint Spiridion, elicited a letter from the Archbishop of

* Parliamentary papers.

Corfu, objecting altogether to the practice of stopping the relics "*of the miracle-working saint*" at the feet of any man. Sir John Young, therefore, put an end to that custom, and also to the prayer for the Queen. Since that period, the representative of Majesty has appeared, indeed, with his staff on such occasions in the balcony of the palace; but he has merely bowed to the Archbishop as he passed.

Towards the close of 1858, occurred the extraordinary robbery, from the Colonial Office, of Sir John Young's famous despatch of the 10th of June, 1857. It appeared in a London journal (the *Daily News*), from which it was copied into many other newspapers. In this despatch, the Lord High Commissioner had recommended that Corfu and Paxo should, with the consent of their inhabitants (which was declared to be probable), be converted into English colonies. Thus, the fears which had been expressed in June, 1857, by the eleventh Parliament, were confirmed eighteen months later amidst the general indignation of the Ionians. The ten members of Corfu, and the two members of Paxo, lost no time in protesting against what they styled "an intrigue against the inhabitants of those islands, who had no other desire than to be united with Greece." Sir George Bowen is universally believed to have been the adviser of Sir John Young in writing that unfortunate despatch.

On the 24th of November, 1858, Mr. Gladstone

arrived at Corfu, accompanied by his family and suite. Amongst the latter, was Mr. (afterwards Sir James) Lacaita, an Italian gentleman, at present one of the members for Naples in the Parliament of Turin. Sir James was very useful to Mr. Gladstone; Italian being the habitual language both spoken and written by the Ionian gentry, especially in Corfu.

Sir John Young appears to have been somewhat embarrassed in arranging the etiquette to be established between a Lord High Commissioner and a "High Commissioner Extraordinary;" which last was the official title of Mr. Gladstone. Finally, the latter landed under a salute from the citadel of seventeen guns. He was received by the commander of the forces, Major-General Sir George Buller, by a guard of honor, and by the principal officers of the garrison. At the palace he was met by Sir John Young and his staff, by his Highness the President of the Senate, the secretaries, and other officials.*

The day following, his commission was read at a full meeting of the Senate. It appointed him High Commissioner Extraordinary, for the purpose of inquiring into "the causes which obstructed or embarrassed the good government of the Islands; and into all matters affecting the well-being and contentment of the inhabitants thereof." And the

* Parliamentary papers.

Lord High Commissioner was directed to furnish him with every assistance, and to take care that he was treated with due respect. Mr. Gladstone then made a speech to the Senate, requesting that it would assist him in the performance of his task. At the same time he gave them distinctly to understand, that he had not come to effect any change in the terms of the Treaty of Paris. This declaration he considered necessary, in consequence of the publication (after he had left London) of the famous despatch of the 10th of June, 1857.

During their first stay in Corfu, of about a fortnight, Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone lived in the palace as the guests of Sir John and Lady Young. The latter gave a series of dinners, and a grand ball, in order that the High Commissioner Extraordinary might meet all the notabilities of the land. Mr. Gladstone held a levee, which was well attended. He was everywhere received with popular manifestations. He visited the Archbishop of Corfu, as well as the President of the Senate.* He passed his mornings in making inquiries and in granting interviews, whilst his secretaries were fully employed in carrying on a voluminous correspondence.

On the 7th of December, 1858, Mr. Gladstone visited Santa Maura, where he was received by the Resident, Baron d'Everton, who of living Englishmen is the best acquainted with the Ionian

* Parliamentary papers.

people. From thence his Excellency proceeded to Ithaca, and next to Cephalonia. Everywhere he was well received, held levees, granted interviews, and prosecuted his inquiries.

Mr. Gladstone arrived at Cephalonia from Samos; and to reach the capital, he had to pass over the long wooden bridge which spans the marshy end of the harbour of Argostoli. There he was met by a crowd, which had caught sight of the two carriages, and which set up a shout of "Union with Greece!" and "Down with the Protection!" whilst copies of printed papers referring to the same subjects were thrown into the carriages. Although the horses were frightened, no accident occurred; and Mr. Gladstone's reception was of a most friendly nature. His visitors, amongst whom was the able Signor Calzoni of Argostoli, succeeded in persuading him that the words "Down with the Protection," did not express the general feeling, though "Union with Greece," considered as a sentiment, undoubtedly did so. As Mr. Gladstone expressed his displeasure at the cries with which he had been received, the Regent Inglessi, with the municipality, and the eight members of the Assembly (then residing in Cephalonia), formally disowned the proceedings, without disclaiming a preference for the Union. Mr. Gladstone finally embraced, rather too hastily, the opinion, that these persons belonged to "the class most closely attached to the present

order of things." In this he was confirmed by "the quiet, though marked civilities," which he ever afterwards met with when he showed himself in public.* He was, however, mistaken in supposing that the people would be content with anything less than the union with Greece. The Ionian gentlemen, who are a very polite race, and who, doubtless, set a just value on the privilege of conversing with so celebrated an Englishman and so distinguished a Philhellene, naturally endeavoured in their intercourse with his Excellency to make things pleasant. Thus they appear to have actually (however unintentionally), deceived the great statesman. Several Cephalonians to this day remember with pride their interview with Mr. Gladstone, when they were charmed with his talents and urbanity. But his visit had little influence on any of their opinions, except to confirm the majority in their ardent desire for the Union.

On the forenoon of the 15th of December, Mr. Gladstone landed at Zante. The official accounts state that seven or eight thousand persons collected on the Mole to welcome him. Greek flags were flying on all sides; placards were also set up, inscribed "Long live the Philhellene Gladstone! Long live Union with Greece!" Shouts to the same effect resounded on his path, as his Ex-

* Parliamentary papers.

cellency, after landing, proceeded to the Residency. Thither the multitude followed, headed by the town band, playing popular tunes. Some crowding and jostling took place at the gate of the Residency, where certain demagogues made themselves conspicuous; amongst these were several priests, a class very hostile to the British Protectorate, and generally believed to be attached to the interests of Russia. The soldiers who formed the High Commissioner's guard of honor, cleared the court-yard of the Residency of some intruders, whose curiosity had carried them too far. But no ill-feeling was displayed by the crowd, who were actuated only by enthusiastic admiration for the distinguished Englishman.*

Mr. Gladstone held a levee at the Residency, and made a speech, which was afterwards translated and distributed, in order to efface the erroneous impression that he had come to grant the union with Greece. This had become necessary, because he had not, on first landing at Corfu, issued any proclamations of his intentions. It was not, as we have seen, until the following day that he had announced to the Senate that the Treaty of Paris was to be rigidly adhered to. Indeed, we have it under his own hand, that it was only the publication of Sir John Young's famous despatch, which caused him at last to speak frankly on the subject.

* Parliamentary papers.

Certainly this want of explicitness, at the outset of his mission, was very ominous of failure. Cunning and diplomatic as the Greeks are by nature, they are yet, I believe, inclined to expect and also to admire straightforward conduct in Englishmen. A suspicion naturally arose that Mr. Gladstone would not have objected to be supposed a secret friend of the Union, with the desire of facilitating the immediate object which he had in view, by gaining the confidence of the Ionians. Be that as it may, he now felt it necessary to deprecate the presenting of petitions which coupled his name with the Union. He assured his hearers that Great Britain was fully determined to maintain the Protectorate, which had been accorded to her by the Treaty of Paris. He appears, however, to have received the petition of the Archbishop and clergy of Zante, although protesting against its contents. A similar petition from the municipality he declined to receive, because it contained an expression "not of the wish merely, but of the *will*, of the Ionian people" for the Union.

Mr. Gladstone granted many private audiences at Zante, and prosecuted his inquiries as usual. In the evening there was a dinner and ball at the Residency, where the principal inhabitants had the honor and pleasure of meeting the great Philhellene. The following day he walked about the town, where, in deference to his lately expressed

* Parliamentary papers.

wishes, there were no more shouts and demonstrations for the Union. That evening his Excellency dined with the Regent, and afterwards attended the theatre. The latter was crowded with people anxious to see him once more; and he was received with the greatest enthusiasm, whilst the orchestra played "God save the Queen." With a refined feeling, the audience, out of respect to their illustrious visitor, abstained from giving expression to the thoughts and hopes which filled their minds, and satisfied themselves by expressing their admiration by constant cheering. Mr. Gladstone embarked on board H.M.S. *Terrible*, amidst the renewed cheers of the inhabitants. Two hours later the vessel started for Athens.*

The High Commissioner Extraordinary was received by the King and Queen of Greece in a very flattering manner. He had interviews with the ministers and leading personages; and he came to the conclusion that from various causes there existed on the Greek continent no very anxious desire to acquire the Seven Islands. That certain jealousies and difficulties on both sides had always existed on this question, is very well known; but there is reason to believe that the indifference affected at Athens was merely a blind to deceive, as well as to flatter the great Englishman. At all events, it is now no longer a secret that the *New*

* Paliamentary papers.

Era,* newspaper in Corfu, the great champion of the Union, was in the pay at this very time of the Government of Otho, and so continued until the latter lost his crown. With the fall of that monarch the *New Era* at once vanished from the political scene.

From Athens, Mr. Gladstone returned to Corfu, where he occupied a house which he had hired for the purpose. Although he still used the palace occasionally for receptions and levees, he ceased to be the guest of the Lord High Commissioner. In fact, a coldness had sprung up, as was only too natural, between the two Commissioners. However delicately and generously Mr. Gladstone performed his mission, it was impossible that it could be otherwise than offensive to Sir John Young. The want of confidence, and the absence of support on the part of the Minister for the Colonies, added to the embarrassing and humiliating position of the Lord High Commissioner. To the public, indeed, the latter appeared to be upon his trial, whilst the finding and sentence depended on the will of his rival the High Commissioner Extraordinary.

It was evident that this state of things could not last. The English and Ionian friends of the Protectorate sympathized with the feelings of Sir John and Lady Young, and were strongly opposed to

* Νέα Ἐποχή.

the plans of the High Commissioner Extraordinary. There were still two of the Seven "Illustrious Islands"* which Mr. Gladstone had not visited, namely Cerigo and Paxo. The former was distant as well as difficult and uncertain of access, especially in winter. But his Excellency now visited the little island of Paxo. Here he stayed only a few hours; but he held a levee, and gave audiences, and made inquiries, as usual. At Paxo, as everywhere else, he showed the most unbounded veneration for the dignitaries of the Greek Church. In Corfu, he had excited the, perhaps illiberal, disgust of the English, by publicly kissing the hand of the Archbishop and dutifully receiving his blessing. In Cephalonia and Zante he had pursued the same conduct. Such proceedings astonished the English, who were not aware, apparently, that there exists in England a considerable party which cherishes a kindly feeling towards the Greek Church. The simple Bishop of Paxo appears, also, to have been ignorant of the etiquette which the High Commissioner Extraordinary practised with ecclesiastical dignitaries. Mr. Gladstone, having taken and respectfully kissed the Bishop's hand, leaned forward to receive the orthodox blessing. The Bishop hesitated, not knowing what was expected of him; and not imagining, perhaps, that a member of the Anglican Church could require his benedic-

* So called in the famous despatch of the Colonial Minister.

tion. At last, however, he perceived the truth, and, bending forward, he hastened to comply with the flattering desire of the Representative of the British Crown. But at this moment, unfortunately, Mr. Gladstone, imagining that the deferred blessing was not forthcoming, suddenly raised his head, and struck the episcopal chin. The Resident and other spectators of the scene had considerable difficulty in maintaining the gravity befitting so solemn an occasion.

The High Commissioner Extraordinary learned that the strong desire for the Union existing in Paxo dated from the time that two Corfu editors were confined on the island by Lord Seaton, soon after his lordship had established the so-called freedom of the press.

Before visiting this island, Mr. Gladstone had recommended the recall of Sir John Young; who was not, as he thought, the proper person to bring in the necessary reforms; especially after the publication of the famous despatch already mentioned.* But Sir John had been guilty of another offence. He had expressed his opinion that some change was required in the position of the Protectorate towards the Islands; and by this idea he had displeased both the Colonial Minister and Mr. Gladstone. Sir George Bowen, the Secretary at Corfu, was supposed to have been the originator both of the despatch and of the proposed

* Parliamentary papers.

modification of Lord Seaton's reforms. But it was the opinion of every one well acquainted with the Ionians, that their proper government would become impossible if some such change were not made. In fact, to grant the cession of the Islands to Greece was the only sensible alternative to the carrying out the plans proposed by Sir John Young.

Mr. Gladstone had decided to assemble the Parliament, and to lay before it certain propositions of reforms. He now recommended that a new Lord High Commissioner should be appointed to carry out these measures. But he was requested by the Colonial Minister to perform the task himself: and he was, consequently, appointed Lord High Commissioner in a letter dated the 8th of January, 1859. Mr. Gladstone, in recommending the removal of Sir John Young, had, however, advised that he should be honorably employed elsewhere. He praised his general policy, and especially the mildness with which he had treated both the hostility of the Assembly, and that of the Municipal Council of Corfu.* Sir John and Lady Young took their departure on the 25th of January, 1859, amidst the general regrets of the Ionian and English inhabitants.

* Mr. John Gardner, in his pamphlet on the Ionian Islands, insinuates that in Sir John Young the Ionians found a King *Log*. He adds, that they "deserved a King *Stork*." His work came out in 1859; so that I am uncertain whether his remark was prophetical or simply historical.

CHAPTER IX.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, NINTH LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[JANUARY, 1859.]

Mr. Gladstone's Message to the Assembly—Declaration in favour of Union—Petition to her Majesty—Its Rejection—Ionian Idea of the Duties of the Protectorate—Conduct of the Protectionists—Count Dusmani, Mr. Gladstone, Gil Blas—The proposed Reforms—Proposed Responsibility of the Lord High Commissioner—Rejection of the Reforms—Mr. Gladstone's good Advice—Desires to raise the Position of the Judges—Defects of Mr. Gladstone's Plan—Proposed Reduction of Members' Salaries—Mr. Gladstone's Departure—Disrespect of the Assembly—Want of Generosity in Mr. Gladstone—Unenviable Legacy left by him—His skilful Retreat from a bad Position.

MR. GLADSTONE received on the 18th of January, 1859, his commission as Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands. He did not, however, assume office till the 25th of the same month, after the departure of Sir John Young. It was solely as a temporary measure that he had taken the post. He had only been installed in office for one week, when, on the 1st of February, he sent in his resignation to Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton. But he performed the duties of his post till his departure, on

the 19th of February, after the arrival of his successor. His actual rule, therefore, as Lord High Commissioner, lasted only fourteen days; whilst his whole stay in the Island was of somewhat less than three months' duration. His speedy resignation was hastened by the complete failure of his mission. It is a curious circumstance, that on the same day that Mr. Gladstone wrote to the Colonial Secretary to resign his office, that minister addressed to him a letter containing the thanks of her Majesty for the public service which he had performed by accepting it. In the same letter it was announced to him that Colonel Sir Henry Knight Storks had been selected to relieve him, as soon as his work should be done. The following details are chiefly taken from the published official documents.

On the day upon which Mr. Gladstone assumed his new office began the extraordinary session of the Legislative Assembly. To the latter he sent a message, announcing his appointment and its object, as well as his intention to lay shortly before them "the principal matters which have appeared to her Majesty to require attention, with a view to the increase of the blessings of good government in these Islands." The first duty of the Assembly was to entertain the message; but, regardless of forms, it proceeded at once to declare vacant four of the ten seats of the members for Cephalonia. A part of the Assembly endeavoured to adjourn the House, till

the vacant seats were filled by re-election; though the law only required the presence of twenty-two out of the forty-two members in order to make a House. This last motion was seconded by Signor Lombardo, the most violent of demagogues, and the most constant enemy of the British Protectorate. This motion was not, however, carried; but an immediate declaration in favour of the Union was seconded, and was backed up by the furious applause of the crowded galleries. This motion was finally unanimously passed two days later, in the following form: "The Assembly of the Seven Islands proclaims that the sole and unanimous will (θέλησις) of the Ionian people has been, and is, the Union of the Seven Islands with Greece."

"A committee of eleven members shall be appointed to submit to the Chamber its opinion on the ulterior measures suitable to the proclamation of Union, this day adopted in the Assembly."

There was in the town a partial illumination in the evening, in honor of the Union.

On the 28th of January Mr. Gladstone sent a message to the Chamber. He pointed out to it the illegal and unconstitutional proceedings which it had adopted; and he advised it to employ the committee, which it had appointed, in drawing up a petition to the Queen, in accordance with the constitution. In spite of opposition, from Lombardo and others, the advice of Mr. Gladstone was eventually adopted by

a very great majority. Even many friends of the Protectorate voted for the petition. They felt certain that it would be rejected, and they hoped that a harassing and troublesome question would thus be set at rest for a long time. Signor Lombardo and his friends voted against the petition upon that very account. He declared that nothing but Union would be accepted from England. He promised, however, that if it were granted, the British nation would obtain thereby an immense accession of power and influence in the East.*

The petition was adopted on the 30th of January. On the 1st of February, Mr. Gladstone forwarded it to England by telegraph, and on the same day he sent in his resignation of office, as already mentioned. He appears still to have doubted the sincerity of the Parliament, in its expressed desire for the Union. It does not appear that he as yet despaired of passing his proposed reforms. On the 2nd of February the Colonial Minister telegraphed her Majesty's answer to the petition. It was as follows:

"1st. Her Majesty has taken into her gracious consideration the prayer of the petition of the Legislative Assembly of the Ionian Islands, with reference to the interests of the Islands themselves, of the States in their neighbourhood, and of the general peace.

* arliamentary papers.

"2nd. Having regard to these objects, her Majesty, invested by the Treaty of Paris with the exclusive Protectorate of the Ionian State, and constituted the sole organ of that State in the councils of Europe, can neither consent to abandon the obligations she has undertaken, nor can convey, nor permit any application to any other Power in furtherance of any similar design.

"3rd. Her Majesty does not desire to impose new fetters on opinion, but she will enforce, wherever it is placed in her charge, the sacred duty of obedience to the laws.

"4th. Her Majesty has adopted, on her part, the measures which she deems most conducive to the good of the Ionian people, and she awaits the enlightened co-operation of their Parliament."

The question of the Union being thus summarily disposed of, the road was left clear for the introduction of the reforms. These were soon after laid before the Assembly by Mr. Gladstone, in a series of resolutions. But by the 8th of February he had begun to fear that the Chamber would, "in one mode or other, get rid of the resolutions." In his despatch of that date he made an observation of great truth, but which he had not sufficiently weighed before promulgating his plan: "The upper class has in these Islands been accustomed to leave and to throw all responsibility on the British Government." Not only the upper class, but the

Ionians generally, were of opinion that if the British Protectorate were necessary, it was necessary also that it should govern, and be responsible for everything. Small, half-civilized States (especially in or near the East) can hardly be expected to cherish other sentiments. The great struggle of the Ionians was not for mere liberty. The real cause of excitement was the religious and patriotic enthusiasm for nationality, and for the re-establishment of a great Greek empire. The upper classes, in theory, sympathized with these views. But with them it was, naturally, a secondary consideration to the security of life and property. They considered that the democratic element in the constitution was already too strong. They could not, therefore, approve of Mr. Gladstone's reforms. They desired the continuance of the Protectorate, but only on condition that it should really govern. Some of these men, who had long supported it with fidelity, frankly explained their views when questioned by Mr. Gladstone. They considered his proposed reforms inexpedient if the Protectorate were to be maintained; and they were convinced, moreover, that the Assembly would never pass them. With reference to this matter, the case of Count Dusmani is worthy of mention. That gentleman entered into public life in 1829. After twenty-four years of valuable service to his country and to the Protectorate, he was made General Secretary of the

Senate. Several successive Lord High Commissioners—Lord Seaton, Sir Henry Ward, and Sir John Young—have recorded in the strongest terms their very high estimate of the services and of the character of Count Dusmani. This highly-respected official was, naturally, consulted by Mr. Gladstone (who gave him an audience on the 6th of December, 1858) regarding the contemplated reforms. The Count (unmindful of the example of Gil Blas's treatment by the Archbishop of Granada, under similar circumstances) gave his real opinion, which was also the general opinion, that is against the reforms. On the 20th of January, 1859, his Excellency wrote, nevertheless, to Count Dusmani, desiring him to co-operate in the success of the reform resolutions. The Count exerted himself to fulfil the wishes of the Lord High Commissioner. But he could effect nothing against the unanimous hostility of the Assembly. In two subsequent conversations, on the 7th and 8th of February, the Count frankly informed Mr. Gladstone that his propositions would meet with a very unfavourable reception. For his sincerity, Count Dusmani was subsequently removed from his office, by the influence of the ex-Lord High Commissioner, transformed into the actual Chancellor of the Exchequer. Thus was at length vented, on the unfortunate Ionian Protectionist, the wrath occasioned by a failure due only to the sanguine, but, to their

purpose, ill-adapted schemes of a gifted Englishman.

On the 5th of February, 1859, his Excellency made a long and most able speech to the Assembly. It began by a treatise upon the principal guarantees of constitutional freedom and of good government. It then proceeded to point out existing defects in the Ionian constitution, and to propose their remedies. It dwelt especially on the necessity of establishing harmony between the Executive and the Legislature. It suggested that the Senate should be deprived of its executive functions and become an Upper Chamber; that the Assembly should control the purse, and that responsible ministers should be appointed by the Lord High Commissioner. The ministers were to be subject to removal by a vote of the two Chambers. The powers of the high police were to be abolished. Further, the Legislative Chamber was to have the right to send an agent to England to support a petition against the Lord High Commissioner "for grave malversation in the exercise of his office," to which her Majesty would grant a judicial hearing.*

For the last-named proposal Mr. Gladstone was very severely condemned, not only by the English in Corfu, but generally by the press at home. Yet it only restored to the Ionians that privilege of appeal to the highest authorities which they had

* Parliamentary papers.

always enjoyed under the rule of Venice.* Taken as a whole, the changes proposed would, if carried out, have placed the Islands in almost every respect upon the footing of an ordinary British colony, with the addition of vote by ballot. But any approach in the proposed changes to the system of a colony was sure to excite the anger of the Ionians. The especial objection, however, to the passing of the resolutions was the fear, on the part of the Assembly, of appearing to give even an implied acquiescence in a Protectorate, which it declared had, in 1815, been imposed upon the Ionians without their consent, and contrary to their wishes.

The Assembly finally passed the following resolutions:

"1st. That the reforms be declared inadmissible.

"2nd. That a committee of five members be named, which shall frame and lay before the Chamber an answer to the several communications of the Lord High Commissioner."

With the exception of Count Flamburiari, the president, the vote of the Assembly was unanimous as regarded those present. But nine members absented themselves from the division, six of whom were opposed to the vote, and in favour of considering the reforms, but had not the moral courage to defend and vote for them.

The hostile votes had been hastened by an un-

* Vide pages 20 and 22 of the Introductory Historical Sketch.

founded report, propagated by Signor Dandolo, that the Assembly would be prorogued if the debates were not immediately closed. Mr. Gladstone also complained of "the childish manner" in which the Assembly acted; by debating first, and then framing the motion which they determined to pass. There can be no doubt that the determination to accept nothing but the union with Greece (whatever may have been the intrigues and insincerity of particular members) was the great cause of the failure of Mr. Gladstone's reforms; which were, moreover, better fitted for some Anglo-Saxon community than for a people whose legislators he himself accused of childishness. He, however, was induced to believe that his failure was mainly attributable to that party which had long and faithfully served the Protectorate, and which thought the Government of the latter to be necessary for the security of the ends for which governments of any kind are mainly established.

His Excellency, in his speech of the 5th of February, 1859, gave the Assembly some good advice, of which I extract only a few specimens: "The reformation of taxes is urgently needed. Your peasantry, sometimes exposed to pressure, pay an artificial price for bread. Your chief products are laden with heavy duties on exports. Burdens are not equally shared between town and country, between producers and consumers." He pointed out to them also that the number of persons receiving

salaries was "disproportionate to the population and to the work to be done. The paid servants of the public, in all classes, are above 2200, among 240,000 inhabitants." He made another important recommendation—namely, "that the Supreme Council (of Justice) *be rendered more independent both of the Lord High Commissioner and of the Assembly, with a view to its greater weight and utility, and that it be consulted on all judicial appointments.*"

It was quite evident, therefore, that Mr. Gladstone could never have contemplated the future removal, without cause assigned, of the chief Ionian judges, whom he thus sought to make independent and powerful. Moreover, he had previously reported to the Government his satisfaction with the Supreme Council, which enjoyed (he declared) the confidence of the country.

By the 10th of February he had discovered, as he believed, the real state of affairs, and with it the utter uselessness of his mission. He wrote to the Colonial Minister: "The majority of the present Assembly are identified with the existing system, either as demagogues or as traffickers in place, and would, I have no doubt, have been most willing to reject the whole plan of constitutional change, which is alike aimed at both, without a moment's delay." The only wonder is that he should ever have thought the passing of his proposed reforms pos-

sible. Neither the English nor the Ionians in Corfu had ever believed it. Both were strongly opposed to the contemplated changes. The Ionians, because they feared that they would thereby be forging chains to bind them for ever to the Protecting Power. The English, because they believed that when the Greek democracy was armed with full powers anarchy would prevail, and material progress would come to an end; or that the Union would still be demanded, and this time with irresistible force. The making a kind of Upper Chamber of the Senate would never have controlled a democratic assembly, founded on very extensive suffrage and vote by ballot.. Even a rich and powerful Upper House could have done little in such a case. But the impoverished and feeble Ionian nobility would never have had the weight nor the moral courage to check the democratic Assembly, which would have held the full power of the purse, and would have virtually named the ministers. As for the Lord High Commissioner, his future task would have been simply to look on whilst the wild demagogues fought for the spoils of the State. Mr. Gladstone not very prudently proposed also to reduce by one-half the salaries of the members of the Legislature, and to make these payable only whilst the House was actually sitting. As too many of the members were penniless Liberals, depending on their salaries, such a proposition was hardly likely to find favour in

their eyes. Finally, the members of the Assembly had become the simple delegates of the multitude, which demanded nothing but the union with Greece.

The Lord High Commissioner had delayed the arrival of his successor in the hopes of his reforms being yet discussed. On the 16th of February, 1859, Sir Henry Storks reached Corfu. Signor Aristotle Valaoriti, an extreme Liberal, had a few days previously declared in the Chamber "that an Assembly which had pronounced the words *'Union with Greece* should not permit any less sacred names to pass its lips." The Lord High Commissioner consoled himself by the fact that the Assembly were in a false position. But on the evening of the arrival of his successor the formal rejection of the resolutions occurred, and his task was finished. He, however, stayed to give Sir Henry Storks the benefit of his advice till the 19th of February. On that day he embarked on board the *Terrible* for Trieste. He departed with all the usual honors. The President and members of the Senate, the principal civil functionaries, and a crowd of ladies and gentlemen assembled to express their feelings of sympathy and regard. The general and superior officers of the garrison were present at the embarkation as a matter of etiquette, but would have equally been there if the option had been left to themselves. A large crowd of spectators lined the walls. A boat,

manned by the young officers of the garrison, took Mr. Gladstone and his family and suite on board the *Terrible* amidst the salutes of the batteries and ships, mingled with the cheers of the spectators.*

The President of the Legislative Assembly, with two or three members, assisted in doing honor to Mr. Gladstone. All the remaining members, although fully aware of his departure, continued their sitting. They did not even send a deputation of their members. This conduct was probably due in a great measure to the proceedings of Mr. Gladstone himself, and of his colonial chief, in supporting against Sir John Young the disrespectful attitude of the Assembly and of the Municipal Council, as related in the preceding chapter.

To love "not wisely, but too well," is a very dangerous quality. It is best to wait for reciprocity before pouring out one's whole heart to strangers. Mr. Gladstone, who had come out such a warm Philhellene, departed thoroughly disgusted with the Greeks in general, and with the Ionians in particular. He would persist in believing that the comparatively few and timid friends of the Protectorate were the chief causes of a failure which was due entirely to the fact, that to understand a people thoroughly even a great genius must live some time amongst them, speak their language, and see them at unguarded social moments. Mr.

* Parliamentary papers.

Gladstone was unjust to many of the Protectionists. Amongst the senators he found a Signor Valaoriti, a man of great ability, who speaks English perfectly, and is well acquainted with England and Englishmen. He was a staunch Protectionist, as long as it was possible to be so without offending the Protectorate itself. But his cousin, Mr. Aristotle Valaoriti, has ever been a sincere and honorable supporter of the Union, and always took a leading part in agitating that favorite question. Mr. Gladstone (not aware of the independent politics constantly pursued by the different members of Ionian families), took it for granted that the Senator approved of the conduct of the deputy. In reporting, on the 17th February, to the Colonial Minister the behaviour of the deputy, he styled him "Signor Aristotle Valaoriti, cousin of the senator of that name, *and united with him in local interests.*"* Nothing could be further from the truth at that time. The staunch Protectionist had nothing in common with the deputy but name and blood. But the senator in vain endeavoured to get any reparation from Mr. Gladstone for this serious though unintentional misrepresentation, and after some correspondence he gave up the task in despair. That the injurious impression remained upon the mind of the British statesman there is too much reason to fear, as at the following quinquennium Signor Va-

* Parliamentary papers.

laoriti, with his relatives and friends, received a treatment somewhat similar to that which was subsequently dealt to Sir George Marcoran and to Count Dusmani. I trust that there is no Briton who is so much the slave of social or of political greatness, or even of genius, as to believe that their possession exonerates any one from the blame due to unfair or ungenerous proceedings.

The summary rejection by telegraph of the petition for the Union by her Majesty, and the nearly as summary refusal of the Legislative Assembly to discuss the proposed reforms, left the Ionian Islands in a more unpromising political position than ever. Mr. Gladstone bequeathed to his successor a most unenviable legacy. The wisest statesman in Europe would have recoiled from the task. One great genius had been sent out by another great genius, and yet had failed unmistakably. It appears, therefore, to have been decided in England that extensive knowledge and distinguished ability were incompatible with success in the Septinsular Republic, and that an ordinary man of business would make the best Lord High Commissioner. With what results this decision was followed, will hereafter fully appear.

The severe manner in which the English press assailed the conduct of the great Philhellene throughout his mission, led the public to expect that Parliament would take up the matter, and call

him to some account. This, however, was not the case, and the subject soon fell into oblivion. The reason was very natural, if we consider the state of political parties at that time. Mr. Gladstone had been sent on his mission by the Conservatives, who could not, therefore, be expected to find fault with his proceedings. On the other hand, the Liberal party was silenced by the fact that on his return to England he became a member of the Whig Cabinet; thus making a most masterly retreat from his serious repulse in the Ionian Islands.

CHAPTER X.

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR HENRY KNIGHT STORKS, TENTH AND LAST LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

[1859 TO 1864.]

Sir H. Storks assumes the Government—Democratic Aspect of the House of Assembly—Sir H. Storks makes Acquaintance with Signor Lascarato—Mysteries of Cephalonia—Lascarato flies to England excommunicated—Severity of his Book—A literary Malay—Warfare with Lombardo—Lascarato in Prison—Slow Justice—Gratitude—A good Protectionist—Count Caruso Enemy of Lascarato—Ball to Sir Henry Storks—Petition that Corfu might be converted into a Colony—Dandolo's Letter to Lord John Russell — Sir Henry's autocratic Self-confidence — Forbearance to the Assembly recommended—Another Holiday decreed—Local Abuses—Attack on Mr. Gladstone in the Assembly—The Lord High Commissioner warns the House—The latter prorogued for six Months—Unnecessary Fears—Anomalous Position of the Protectorate—English Ministers determined to maintain it—Ill-directed Ambition—Advantages of Ignorance—Competition introduced into Offices—Neglect of the Circular of Sir Howard Douglas—The King of Dummies—Case of Sir George Marcoran—The English Judges also attacked—Responsibility of the Lord High Commissioner—Different Manner of Treating the same Offences—The Case of Count Dusmani—Twelfth Parliament imitates its Predecessors—Proposal that his Excellency should address the Assembly in Greek—Opposition of the Chamber—Change in Ionian Sentiments—Protectionists justified—The Protectorate to blame—Increase of British Moral Influence—His Excellency a bad Prophet—Unanimous vote for the Union—Assembly prorogued for Six Months—Conditions of Cession—The Corfu Clubs—The Fortifications—Character of Sir H. Storks—Future of the Greek Race.

THE Ionian Liberals professed themselves by no means flattered at the appointment of a colonel to be Lord High Commissioner, their rulers having

hitherto been either able statesmen, or distinguished general officers. But as Sir Henry Storks was three years later promoted by seniority to the rank of major-general, that objection had only a temporary influence. Moreover, he had served in the Russian war. It is true that the command of the Reserve, and the management of hospitals at Scutari, had kept him from the actual field of glory. But he had not suffered on that account; for he was one of the fortunate few who returned to England covered with the honors without having incurred the dangers of the Crimea.

The new Lord High Commissioner had to begin his career by receiving the refusal of the Assembly, at its extraordinary session, to accede to the propositions of Mr. Gladstone.

On the 1st March, 1859, the ordinary session began. The Assembly was as factious as ever, and resolutely bent on obstructing the government of the Protectorate. It cared not for prorogations, especially as the members continued to draw their salaries, so long as the Parliament was not actually dissolved.

On Saturday, 10th December, 1859, the Assembly was reopened in state after its prorogation, the general and all the field officers preceding the carriage of the Lord High Commissioner. Arrived at the House, his Excellency seated himself on a chair next to that of the President of the Assembly.

The chairs were placed side by side on a slightly raised platform. The chair of the Lord High Commissioner differed only from that of the President of the Assembly by a little gilding. The democratic nature of the Government—in theory, at least—was thus impressed upon the spectator. His Excellency delivered his speech in English. It was then read in Greek by the Secretary of the Assembly. Next, the President of the Assembly read his reply, first in Greek and then in Italian. The House, with its boxes and galleries, in some measure resembled a theatre. Some ladies and gentlemen occupied the boxes, whilst the mob filled the galleries. The President of the Senate had a chair close to one corner of the platform, but not upon it. This circumstance reminded the spectators that his Highness, the nominal head of the State, was in reality but a very subordinate officer. The general and field officers sat in the seats of the members, very few of the latter being present. The respect paid to the Lord High Commissioner was not very great. After the departure of his Excellency and suite, a priest came in to purify and bless the House after its desecration by heretics.

On the 21st December there was a grand ceremony at the palace for the presentation of the address by the Assembly to the Lord High Commissioner. His Excellency was supported on his right by the President of the Senate, with the senators

and other distinguished civilians; and on the left by the general and all the field officers of the garrison. The address being a little milder than was expected, hopes were entertained of a quiet session. It was, in fact, by no means one of the worst, but before it closed the members gave a great deal of trouble. His Excellency was, therefore, heartily glad (after the transaction of the usual business) to be able to prorogue them to March, 1861. He could, in the mean time, rule despotically with his Senate in undisturbed ease and comfort.

Soon after his arrival in the Islands, Sir Henry Storks made, in an interesting manner, the acquaintance of the most honest and the most original, if not the most worldly-wise, gentleman in the Ionian Islands. Signor Andrea Lascarato, a man of good family in Cephalonia, had, in an evil hour for his own peace of mind and for that of his family, assumed the dangerous office of a moral censor and satirist of his countrymen.

In 1856 he published, in his native island, a work in modern Greek, called the "Mysteries of Cephalonia." In that book he did not attack individuals, with the exception of the Archbishop, who, being a single specimen of his class in the island, could not escape in a crowd. His attacks, otherwise, were made upon classes. But none of these were spared. This is not the place

for entering fully into the interesting history of Signor Andrea Lascarato. Suffice it to say, that having excited the indignation of the great majority of his countrymen, and the furious hostility of the democratic party, the then Resident of Cephalonia advised him to quit the country. He fled first to Zante, and then to England, which he had already visited for four months in 1851. He received a copy of his excommunication by the Archbishop of Cephalonia just as he landed for the second time in England. He stayed in London a year, and then returned to the Islands. For a time he lived at Zante, but there he was constantly persecuted, insulted, and terrified by the Ionian rabble; whilst the Resident was desirous to compel him to leave the Island for the sake of peace. The priests denounced him as an atheist; the gentry either joined in the cry, or were silent; the "Mysteries of Cephalonia" having depicted every class of Ionian society, from the highest to the lowest, in the darkest colours. Signor Lascarato had made himself, in fact, a kind of prose Juvenal; writing, however, without the protection of a mighty and benevolent emperor. In spite of his unimpeachable character, it was not in human nature that such a satirist should escape the hatred of his victims. The gross ignorance of the priests, and their pretended miracles, the abject superstition of the masses, and even of many of the gentry, were all eloquently

denounced. Satirists are apt to lose sight of measure and moderation. To read the "Mysteries of Cephalonia" with the faith apparently due to the work of an honest man, intimately acquainted with his subject, was to arrive at a melancholy conclusion. Although the attack was made on the Cephalonians, it was generally interpreted as directed against all Ionians. Indeed, Lascarato esteemed the Zantiots and the Corfiots even less than he did the Cephalonians. Literally to believe his descriptions, the Islanders must pass for being the most wicked, weak, and despicable people on the face of the globe. And yet it is an undoubted fact that many of the Ionian gentry are as honest and gentlemanly as are the upper classes of France or of England. It was chiefly the priests, and the demagogue class of politicians, the deceivers of the ignorant mob, whom Lascarato desired to scourge. But his work had unfortunately the appearance of an indiscriminate fury directed against all classes. He resembled, indeed, a Malay excited by narcotic drugs, running a muck on the high road, and leaving a track of slaughter behind him. The priests and the demagogues, writhing under his lash, shrieked furiously for vengeance, and were by no means scrupulous as to the means of obtaining their object. The notorious anti-English demagogue, Lombardo, appears to have been foremost in denouncing Lascarato to the mob as an atheist. This was an un-

founded charge. The satirist held up the New Testament and the life of Our Saviour as the test and example of his doctrines, and of the iniquities of his victims. There was, therefore, furious literary war between the simple and honest Lascarato and the cunning and intriguing Lombardo. Unfortunately, in his rage, the satirist denounced the demagogue early in 1859, as an arrant rogue as well as a political impostor. Lascarato was tried at Zante for libel. Well aware of the general fury prevailing against him, he failed to appear when summoned. Judgment by default was pronounced against him. He was sentenced to four months imprisonment, an unusually severe sentence. He gave himself up in Cephalonia, and was put, in August, 1859, into the excellent prison, which is one of the numerous monuments of Sir Charles Napier's admirable government.

Signor Lascarato has published in a small pamphlet, in the Italian language, the details of his imprisonment. As his facts have never been doubted, the details must be considered as very disgraceful to the local Government; but they will be reserved for another occasion. It is sufficient here to say that he fell into the power of a brutal tyrant. His jailer nearly broke his heart by cruelties and privations. But Lascarato at length succeeded in conveying a petition to the Lord High Commissioner, fully detailing the case. The result was his joyful

liberation before he had undergone the half of his sentence. This, however, was chiefly due to a petition signed in his favour by the most respectable inhabitants of Cephalonia. The guilty jailer, for some incomprehensible reason, was leniently dealt with. He was removed from Cephalonia, but appointed to an office of trust in Zante, in which he had again the opportunity to exercise his natural brutality. He was finally dismissed from all government employment for an infamous assault upon a very young girl. Justice, though criminally slow, reached him at last in the mild form of a dismissal. The Government could not have done less than it did. It assuredly should have done much more. The gratitude, however, of Lascarato was very great. He had met with such injustice and ill treatment, that the Lord High Commissioner's conduct appeared to him to be a rare act of magnanimity. He did not understand that no English gentleman could possibly have overlooked such a case of tyranny and misconduct in office when brought to his notice.

The open, simple character of Lascarato appears to have charmed Sir Henry Storks. Something like friendship sprang up between them. His Excellency afterwards had occasion to save Lascarato from the narrow-minded zeal of an English Resident, who was anxious to pay court to priests and demagogues, at the expense of an honest Ionian Protectionist. He had persuaded the Lord High

Commissioner that a moral family periodical, established by Lascarato, was directed against religion. He denounced a particular number of the publication; but as neither the Resident nor his chief at Corfu could read a word of Greek, both had arrived at wrong conclusions from a too great dependence on others. To set matters right, poor Lascarato was compelled to translate a very long Greek article into Italian. This he sent to Sir Henry Storks, who, now perfectly satisfied, acquitted him of all blame. His Excellency even became a subscriber to his friend's paper, and accorded him permission to write to him freely. This boon was duly taken advantage of by his humble friend. His persecutions, his journeys to England, his publications (much read but little paid for), had greatly reduced his small private fortune. His writings were all strongly in favour of the British Protectorate, and were in that respect, as well as in original ability and humor, unrivalled in the country. He had certainly some claims upon the Government. By 1862 he had lived down much of his unpopularity. The Protectionists were loud in his praises. The Lord High Commissioner had expressed his great desire to serve him, and for some time, doubtless, had every inclination to do so. In 1862 all the offices of the State held by Greeks fell vacant. Every one expected that Sir Henry would have fulfilled what Lascarato considered a promise, but which was probably, as usual,

rather strongly implied than directly expressed in precise terms.

But Count Caruso had become President of the Senate, and that gentleman had his reasons for hating the honest and frank Ionian, who was well acquainted with his conduct when Regent of Cephalonia.* He succeeded in persuading a man who especially prided himself on never being influenced by any one to change his determination regarding Lascarato. Although he had for three years been intimately acquainted with the latter's previous history, his Excellency now gave him to understand that his being excommunicated made it impossible to employ him, as he had hoped to have done. This was certainly a very late discovery. If it were a good reason for exclusion (which many advocates of expediency might justly consider it), it is yet extraordinary that it took so many years to be appreciated. The sentence of excommunication had been issued in 1859, before Sir Henry Storks had made the acquaintance of Lascarato. Moreover, it had become practically a dead letter. Priests regularly visited the house of Lascarato. His rapidly multiplying family were all baptized in the Greek faith. His dwelling duly received the periodical blessings of the clergy. His family attended the services of the Church. Moreover, he had now acquired many

* I style Signor Caruso, *Count*, because the Government recognized his title. The genuine Counts have, I presume, good reasons for still addressing him as plain Signor.

friends and admirers, and, though still unpopular with the mob, he was sincerely respected by the educated classes, especially those in favour of the Protectorate. I have brought down the history of Signor Lascarato to the year 1863. But I must now revert to an earlier period.

On Monday, the 20th of February, 1860, the Greeks gave Sir Henry Storks their first and last ball. He had not yet become personally very unpopular. The hosts were the members of the Philharmonic Society. It was a very grand affair, with a splendid supper, proving how well the Ionians can arrange such fêtes when it suits them to undertake them.

On Wednesday, the 21st of March, a number of peasants (doubtless excited by eager Protectionists) called at the palace to lay before his Excellency a petition that Corfu might be converted into an English colony. This farce created little impression. The indignation of the Ionians in general, and of the Corfiots in particular, at such an idea, had already in Sir John Young's time been amply proved, so that only gross ignorance could ever have prompted the petitioners. The attempt to renew any agitation on this subject was a truly ridiculous failure.

The Assembly was duly reopened in March, 1861, with the usual ceremonies. The Lord High Commissioner had looked forward with some trepi-

dation to this session. On the 18th of January he had written to the Colonial Minister a remarkable letter asking for instructions. Signor Dandolo had published a letter to Lord John Russell, calling upon his lordship to carry out himself in the Ionian Islands the general doctrines he had laid down in his famous despatch to the minister at Turin, dated the 27th of October, 1860. It was expected that this subject would be discussed by the Assembly. The Lord High Commissioner desired to know if he were "at liberty to stop the discussion, and, if necessary, to prorogue the Parliament?" He also asked if he could "stop the discussion in case the union with Greece should be brought before the Assembly." His Excellency's letter contained a very characteristic sentence worthy of mention:—"On questions of local interest I do not trouble your grace, *because I am able to deal with them myself, and am prepared to take all the responsibility which attaches to them*; but on subjects in which the Protection is interested, and which may give rise to discussion in the Imperial Parliament, or to remarks in foreign journals, I feel it my duty to consult your Grace, and to solicit the precise instructions of her Majesty's Government."*

If the reader of this History have comprehended the despotic powers vested in the Lord High Commissioner, he will understand the importance of the

* Parliamentary papers.

words marked in italics. The public might, but for this candid avowal, have imagined that his Excellency was responsible to the Colonial Minister even in regard to his conduct in local matters. But it is now established, under his own hand, that Sir Henry Storks did not trouble the Duke of Newcastle with local matters, but arranged them at will, free of all responsibility.

The Colonial Minister in reply advised the Lord High Commissioner "to carry forbearance to the utmost limits," and also "to refrain, if it be possible, from putting an end to the session by prorogation as long as there is any hope of the Assembly terminating discussion (if unhappily begun) which," his Grace was convinced "that the best and wisest citizens must deplore." The Duke further wrote: "I must add, however, that to such forbearance there are limits which your own sense of duty will best enable you to fix, and which I will only so far define as to say that any attempt on the part of the Assembly to violate the constitution by an appeal to any power except the Protecting Sovereign, and any language or conduct within the Assembly calculated in your judgment to disturb the state of public peace and tranquillity which now prevails throughout the Ionian Islands, will necessarily compel you to prorogue it."

On the 5th of March, 1861, Sir Henry Storks thus closed his reply to the Colonial Minister: "Your

Grace may rest assured that nothing shall be wanting on my part to preserve the dignity of the Protecting Power, while maintaining that moderation and extending that indulgence to the Legislative Assembly which your Grace recommends."

The labours of the Assembly were brought to a rapid close. They passed, however, one measure in the session. They added another feast-day to the already great number of holidays existing in their calendar. They thus increased instead of diminishing one of the great curses of their national policy. Counting feasts, and Lents, and Sundays, the working year of the Ionians scarcely exceeds two hundred days, to the detriment of trade and of commerce, and to the encouragement of idleness and superstition.

Having thus served their country after their own fashion, the demagogues recommenced their wonted attacks on the Protectorate. An address of the most insulting nature was prepared by a committee of the Assembly. In this document, amidst many calumnies, were mingled also some truths.

To attribute to the Protection all the local effects of bad government in details was unjust; for the Regent and municipalities, since the time of Lord Seaton, had had the management, and deserved the responsibility of these matters. The Regents might, it is true, be inefficient, owing to improper appointments by the Lord High Commissioner. But the

five municipal officers in each island were democrats, elected by the people, and could fully control the local expenditure. The roads, for instance, no longer in the charge of Englishmen, fell into decay, especially in the out-stations, where the hands of the Residents were tied, both by the jealousy of the Lord High Commissioner and by the increased power of the Regents. Even the influence of the Residents became almost null, from the ignorance of the Greek language, which threw most of them entirely into the hands of their secretaries and chiefs of police. The daily and bi-weekly proceedings of the Regents and municipalities, all entered in Greek, had to be read and signed as approved by the Residents. These had to take their contents on credit, and rest satisfied with the assurance of their secretaries that all was right. In the same manner, all petitions and all verbal complaints must pass through the interpreting secretary to be explained or smothered, as the latter pleased. Local matters of detail were thus entirely in Greek hands, except where the Lord High Commissioner personally interfered.

Some parts of the address, which alluded to the despotic nature of the Protecting Government, were certainly true. But as the Assembly had refused the reforms proposed by Mr. Gladstone, they had no right to complain of evils which they had declined to remedy.

Signor Bacconi read to the Assembly a long paper, which was laid on the table, and ordered for discussion on Tuesday, the 12th of March. But that discussion was not destined to occur. This document was more insulting than even the before-mentioned intended address. The first sentence, not very clear in expression, was personally hostile to Mr. Gladstone. It said, "Mr. Gladstone, two years back, having persuaded us to submit to her Majesty the Queen of England the question of Union, left, perhaps, with the idea that he had succeeded in terminating the struggle between the Seven Islands and the Protectorate. He doubtless permitted this negative solution to become known, under a cloud of artificial and studied phrases, in order to conceal the object of his mission." Having begun with this assault upon Mr. Gladstone, the orator proceeded to attack the Protectorate in general, and to praise his own countrymen.

Another proposition for an address was signed by Signor Lombardo and two members. It recapitulated all the griefs of Greece in general, and of the Ionians in particular. It styled the Septinsular Republic "the first star in the political regeneration of the East." But with his usual notorious contempt for facts, Signor Lombardo forgot to add that if the Ionians were more civilized than the rest of the Greek race, it was chiefly to the Protectorate of Great Britain that such a result was due.

On the 12th of March a message was sent to the House of Assembly by the Lord High Commissioner to warn the members against entertaining discussions "clearly contrary to the constitution." On the message being delivered to the House by the secretary, Sir Henry Wolff, Signor Lombardo rose and spoke in strong terms against the Lord High Commissioner and the Protectorate.* He proposed that the members of the Assembly should resign "en masse," since the right of discussion was denied to them. Other violent propositions followed. An adjournment for half an hour was at last carried. The members assembled in a committee-room, where they decided to disregard the injunctions of the Lord High Commissioner, and to make a protest against his interference.†

On the House reassembling, and before it had time to prove what collective course it would finally take, the secretary reappeared amongst the excited members, with a message for the President, Count Flamburiari, proroguing the Assembly for six months. Certainly the indulgence recommended by the Colonial Minister had not been overstrained by this hasty dismissal of the Assembly, before it had actually adopted any resolution.

In describing these events to the Colonial Minister, Sir Henry Storks thus concluded his letter, written on the same day: "The most perfect tranquillity

* Parliamentary papers. † Ibid.

prevails, and I see no chance of its being disturbed, although, if I had permitted this scene of disorder to continue, I do not know to what lengths the public feeling might have been stimulated. The prorogation has been favourably received in Corfu, and has created no sensation." The political excitement was certainly only of a moral kind; for no one supposed that physical force would be employed by the quiet Corfiots against the overwhelming strength of the Protectorate. But to say that "the prorogation was favourably received in Corfu," was a part of that blind self-deluding policy then prevailing. The native population were of course, generally, of the same opinion as their representatives. Most of the English also considered that too much haste and impatience had been exhibited. Great strength can afford to be calm and confident in the presence of irritating weakness. There was something ludicrous in displaying great fear lest the Assembly should express in the eleventh Parliament sentiments which had long before been proclaimed in the ninth and tenth Parliaments.

On the 18th of March, Sir Henry Storks addressed another letter to the Colonial Minister. Forgetting that six days previously he had assured him that the most perfect tranquillity prevailed, he wrote: "The country has now *resumed* a state of perfect tranquillity." No unprejudiced person out of the official circle ever believed for a moment any

disturbance of tranquillity to be possible. Indeed, since the time that Sir Henry Ward had crushed the partial revolt in Cephalonia, the most ignorant peasants in the Seven Islands could no longer be betrayed into physical contests with the Protectorate. In Corfu especially, which had never been disturbed for half a century, outbreaks might reasonably be considered as utterly impossible. Pretended fears of riots were, however, the constant weapons of certain politicians, who grossly deceived the Lord High Commissioner when they induced him so easily to credit their reports.

Great Britain now occupied a very anomalous position in the Islands. The Lord High Commissioner, in spite of much despotic power, was unable to effect any important improvements. The Assembly desired the Union, opposed the Protectorate, and detested its representative, whom, assisted by the press, it treated with open contempt. It was evident to all impartial observers that if the Islands were to continue their connexion with Great Britain to any useful purpose, it was necessary to remodel the changes introduced by Lord Seaton. The only alternative worthy of England was to concede the much-coveted Union without delay.

Practically, Sir Henry Storks did, of his own authority, modify some of the reforms of 1848; and had his Excellency not too plainly proved his love for despotism everywhere, and for its own sake, its

occasional assumption for the public benefit would have merited great indulgences from Englishmen. In 1862 he, through the Senate, gave orders that the municipal officers, at their meetings in council, should propose no laws or regulations except through the Regents. Now the latter obeyed the Senate, that is the Lord High Commissioner. To his Excellency, therefore, the road became free for checking the local mismanagement as to roads, convents, forests, and other details. In Cephalonia especially, where he placed the forests in the hands of the Residents and police, some check was given to the cutting and burning of the magnificent pines on the mountains. Generally speaking, the municipal officers, the slaves of the people, on whose votes they depended, were more ready to pass measures to encourage than to repress abuses. Carrying on the details of government, they ruled supreme in those Islands where the Residents, isolated from the people, and misled by their subordinates, had little influence to make up for their notorious want of power.

But if the object had been to preserve the Protectorate, in accordance with the Treaty of Paris, the simple course would have been to give the reins to the Assembly, and to permit it to stultify itself by acts of rebellion against the treaty and constitution, under which it alone exercised any legal powers. But in that case Great Britain, by withdrawing past

concessions, would have shaken her position in the world as the great friend of progress and of liberty. To advance, not to recede, is her apparent destiny. Let her then learn, by this experience, not to proceed herself too rapidly on the road of great political changes.

On the 22nd of April, 1861, the Colonial Minister declared in the House of Lords that the Government was determined to maintain the Protectorate, as established by the Treaty of Paris. On the 7th of May following, the Chancellor of the Exchequer denounced in the House of Commons the cession of the Islands as "nothing less than a crime against the safety of Europe." So limited is the foresight and wisdom of the greatest statesmen!

The great idea of the last Lord High Commissioner was to govern the Ionian Islands despotically by his own unaided genius. But it is now, I think, the general opinion that he greatly overrated his own ability and knowledge. That he is a good man of business is universally acknowledged; but as a statesman, he has not acquired any reputation for wisdom or foresight since he adopted a political career. It was generally believed that Sir John Young had depended very greatly upon his secretary, who had the credit of concocting that famous despatch which was the original cause of his chief's misfortunes. This circumstance appears to have given an additional spur to the already natural strong jealousy of

the new ruler. To govern entirely alone, or with such subordinate inferiors, as could give no umbrage to his pride, became now the established plan in theory. In practice, however, the new Government was often unconsciously made the tool of designing intriguers. Sir Henry Storks had not been long in Corfu before it became evident that if men of ability were to be ever employed, it would be rather in spite, than on account, of their personal merits. It would be necessary for them to get rid of all opinions of their own, and of all independence of character. Proverbial dulness, and even indifferent character, were no obstacles to high office, if compensated for by sufficient subserviency.* But how was such a line of policy to meet with the approval of the Colonial Minister, and of the public at home? As to the former, he was to be kept in ignorance, or rather, he was not to be "*troubled*" with local matters. As to the public at home, its indifference to colonies and dependencies (especially when small) was the best safeguard. With regard to the public at Corfu, he took his own measures for maintaining secresy. The Ionian press was, indeed, free; but as its language was modern Greek, it had little chance of enlightening the English public. His

* "Now, as I have often had occasion to observe in public life, the evil of placing men of mediocrity in high office is by no means merely to be measured by the incompetent discharge of their official duty. It makes them resist and oppose as far as possible the entrance into a like employment of any brighter genius. They are striving to pull down the whole administration to the same stupid level as their own."—Earl Stanhope's *Life of Pitt.*

Excellency took good care that no English newspaper should long exist in the Islands. But, to his great horror, a local kind of *Punch* started into existence, under the editorship of a popular officer on the general's staff. Although it was only filled with domestic chit-chat, and light stories in prose and verse, he seized the first opportunity to put an end to its existence. As far as regarded the English, such of them as could not read the Greek journals generally learnt from the London papers all the chief local news.

Sir Henry Storks introduced one measure, for which he was praised in the House of Lords by the Colonial Minister. Clerkships, and other petty appointments held by natives, were given up to public competition. But this bidding for popularity involved no sacrifice on the part of his Excellency, who could not have filled up those trifling posts except on the recommendation of others. In putting them up to competition he saved himself a great deal of trouble. All the important patronage he still reserved for himself, and he generally distributed it in a manner notoriously inconsistent with the system which he had adopted for the petty situations above mentioned. If this be doubted, why, it may well be asked, did Sir Henry Storks never enforce the excellent order of Sir Howard Douglas (founded upon the simplest justice and common sense), which required a knowledge of the Greek language from

all the English officials? It is notorious that this order remained a completely dead letter, and that one of the chief causes of the discontent of the Ionians against the British Government, was the appointment of young, ignorant, and inexperienced Residents to preside over the Islands. When the vote for the Union was carried in October, 1863, only one of the five English Residents was acquainted with the language of the people over whom they presided as the representatives of England.*

In the filling up of the Regencies, and other important posts, the same principle of capricious selections, wholly independent of merit and fitness, was carried out at the expense of the natives. It was not thus that Napoleon, or Nelson, or Wellington, or the Marquis Wellesley, or Lord Clyde, attained to greatness and renown. Of them could never be said what one of the ablest and most honest of Ionians printed of his Excellency. After giving Sir Henry Storks great credit for good intentions, Signor Lascarato thus graphically accounts for the failure of his policy: "But Signor Storks has preferred to be the king of Dummies rather than be the colleague of men."†

* The writer of these pages, on one occasion, himself interpreted for a Resident in his own island, to a peasant whom he wished to call upon him the following day, but to whom he could not speak a word.

† "Ma il Signor Storks ha preferito di esser il *Re delle carogne*, più tosto che il collega d'uomini;" literally *King of Carcases*, which, however, does not give a clear idea in English.

Even the appointment of judges was made subservient to official caprice or to political intrigues. An excellent Zantiot, who was a judge in Cephalonia, lost his post because a private letter which he had written to a friend in London found its way to Corfu, and contained complaints of the general system of government. The worthy judge retired into private life at Zante, amidst the regrets of the Cephalonians, to whom he had so long dispensed justice. But this, and many other similar cases, were soon forgotten in the great act of injustice committed against Sir George Marcoran.

The only case of an actual removal of one of the supreme judges, which had been sanctioned by the British Government, had occurred in 1834. At that time the judges made no objection to their not being reappointed, as they were very old men, one of them being in his eighty-second year. Sir George Marcoran had succeeded Count Delladecima as judge in 1840 under the rule of Sir Howard Douglas. His predecessor, although he had found his judicial duties too trying for his health, was far from being altogether shelved. On the contrary, the Count became at once Archon of Public Instruction, and was subsequently made President of the Senate by Mr. Mackenzie. Finally, after his noble resignation of the latter office, already mentioned,*

* Vide page 157.

he was, under Lord Seaton, made President of the Assembly. From 1840 to 1862 Sir George Marcoran acted as supreme judge, giving perfect satisfaction to the Government. Nevertheless, at the termination of the last quinquennium, to the surprise of every one, neither of the two judges of the Supreme Council of Justice were reappointed; notwithstanding that Mr. Gladstone, in his report in 1859, had praised the court, and declared that it enjoyed the confidence of the country. The case of Sir George Marcoran was one of especial hardship, for he had held his office during nearly a quarter of a century, exposed daily to the observation of a small and scandal-loving society; and yet not a syllable had been heard impugning his conduct or character. Of course there were occasionally a few persons who were dissatisfied with the decisions of the judges. The Ionians are very fond of litigation, and each contending party is generally convinced of the justice of its own claims. The losing side, therefore, is often disposed to exclaim against fancied injustice. But as the tribunal decided in a body, the complaints directed against it implicated the English as much as the Ionian judges. Sir Henry Storks, therefore, in a memorandum to the Colonial Minister (which he, probably, supposed would never see the light), insinuated that the English members of the Council, from their ignorance of the local laws, and of the Greek language,

were led astray by their Ionian colleagues.* Unfortunately for this idea, it was notorious that the English judges were both of them not only very able men, but masters also of modern Greek and of the Septinsular code of laws. But the worst part of this affair was the attempt made in the House of Lords to throw the responsibility of the treatment of the judges upon the Ionian Senate. His Excellency never lost, as we have seen, any opportunity of asserting as well as of proving by his conduct that he was responsible for all the local matters of his Government.† He could not pretend (although his supporters at home did so) that he, "*merely did not give his veto*" to a measure which was entirely his own act. In his famous memorandum of November, 1862, he had used these words regarding his treatment of the judges:—"I have convinced myself of the necessity of the change, and accept the entire responsibility of having approved the decision of the Ionian Senate." This was as frank as could be expected under the circumstances. He could not, of course, write:—"The Senate are my

* In Count Caruso's description of the beguiling of the two Britons by the two Ionians, the reader is presented with an accurate description of the division of labour employed on the occasion. After describing the misplaced confidence of Judge Colquhoun in Judge Xydias, the document proceeds: "in the same way the other English member, Sir C. Sargent, came under the influence of Chevalier Marcoran."

†His Excellency was reported to have said to a Zantiot, who spoke to him about referring some matter to the Senate, "Senate, I am the Senate! I am Alpha and Omega." The story, true or false, is at least *ben trovato*, except, perhaps, that so much knowledge of Greek in the speaker may appear to be incredible.

tools, and do whatever I bid them." But he certainly sufficiently negatived beforehand the spirit of the defence set up for him by his friends.*

Sir George Marcoran required only to serve for a few more months in order to obtain the highest grade of pension, which he had so well merited. Lord Seaton, Sir Henry Ward, and Sir John Young had all confirmed him in his high judicial office. It was reserved for the last Lord High Commissioner to endeavour to cover with unmerited disgrace this tried and valued servant of the British Protectorate. The excellence of Sir George Marcoran's character has been established beyond all contradiction. All the rage of his enemies has failed to discover the smallest offence against him, for surely the contemptible general insinuations on the part of Count Caruso, that Sir George Marcoran had received, at his private house, some political enemies of the Government, are too ludicrous to deserve serious notice at the hands of any gentleman. If Sir George Marcoran was removed on account of his being a secret politician, then it follows, of course, that no supreme judge should be a party man. Yet he was replaced by the President of the Senate which had removed

* Sir George Marcoran, in his pamphlet, justly ridicules the attempt to make the Senate responsible for his removal from office. Never were truer words printed than the following statement of that injured judge: "Le Lord Haut Commissaire a voulu, et cette volonté a été revêtue d'un type. La *forte opinion* du Sénat n'est que l'arrangement de la forme extérieure de l'Acte."

him, and who ascended the chief tribunal hot from the excitement of recent political warfare.*

But even if the views of Sir George Marcoran had been openly avowed as hostile to the Government, and had, therefore, been held sufficient to justify his disgrace, surely the same rûle should have been applied to all other judges. How is it, then, that a certain judge of Zante was reappointed to his post at the last quinquennium? That gentleman (a Cephalonian of good family) I believe to be an able and upright man. But if to talk politics be a crime in a judge, then is the gentleman in question the greatest of criminals, for he has lost no opportunity of promulgating his opinions. On one occasion he made the errors, real or supposed, of the Lord High Commissioner the theme of indignant condemnation in a long conversation with one of his Excellency's Residents. Nor was he more reserved in general society. On the contrary, he never pretended to make any secret of his opinions. The writer of these pages, therefore, ventured to inquire of him how he had escaped supercession. With the noble frankness for which he is distinguished, the judge confessed his utter ignorance of the cause of his escape, and fully acknowledged its

* The Lord Chancellor, though in the same cabinet with the Duke of Newcastle, thus spoke in the House of Lords on the 30th June, 1863: "I would not for a moment have insinuated a charge, because I spoke with great sympathy for these judges, than one of whom, Sir George Marcoran, I have been assured by friends who were acquainted with the Ionian Islands, there was not a more upright or honorable man in the world."

strangeness. Why private political opinions should be a crime in a Corfiot judge, and their more open promulgation be innocuous in a Zantiot judge, forms one of those puzzling inconsistencies which are apt to arise when despotism, not reason, rules.

The case of Count Dusmani, the staunch Protectionist Secretary, though not an infraction of even the spirit of the law (as was that of the judges), was, nevertheless, a serious offence against equity and sound morality. But for this dismissal, there is reason to believe that Sir Henry Storks was not principally to blame. From the moment it was resolved at home that the Islands should be given up, the services of Protectionists could no longer be required. Yet, as Count Caruso was made President of the Senate in the twelfth Parliament as a reward for his supposed services to the Protectorate, we must search elsewhere for the reasons which led to the disgrace of Count Dusmani. Nor will the task be difficult for any rational man who has read Mr. Gladstone's speech of the 12th May, 1863, which proves that Count Dusmani had never been forgiven for his frankness, a few years earlier, to the then "High Commissioner Extraordinary."*

Even those who, like the author, can sympathize strongly with the national feelings of the honest

* A liberal Corfu paper, in 1862, taunted Count Dusmani, Sir George Marcoran, and the other shelved Protectionists, with having been treated by the British Government like oranges, *which are first well sucked, and then thrown away.*

portion of the Ionian Liberals, may be allowed to feel a just indignation at the ingratitude shown to several honorable and excellent Protectionists. For many of these gentlemen, though accused of being actuated by selfish motives, yet sincerely believed that the safety and prosperity of the Ionians depended on their remaining under the protection of England.

The twelfth Parliament opened on the 1st March, 1862; and displayed, without delay, the wonted animosity against the Government. It began by reducing the salary of the hated President of the Senate, Count Caruso. It also reduced other salaries. But it would have obtained more respect if the stipend of the members of Parliament had also been reduced. The Assembly elected for its own President Signor Zervo, who had formerly been repeatedly banished under Lord Seaton and Sir Henry Ward, by virtue of the high police powers. His election was confirmed by the Lord High Commissioner, and from that moment he, with a few followers, abandoned the extreme party, and proclaimed himself a reformer. After the speeches in 1861 of English Ministers in both Houses of Parliament, Zervo appears to have considered it useless to demand, for the present, union with Greece, from the strong and apparently determined Protectorate. Although many looked upon him as a renegade from his party, he was well supported by the majo-

rity of his Cephalonian countrymen. He was, however, unable, in spite of his great eloquence, to check in the Assembly the aspirations for the immediate crowning of the national wishes.

One of the propositions made in the twelfth Parliament was the assertion of the right of the Assembly to be addressed in Greek instead of in English by the Lord High Commissioner. It was referred to a committee, and subsequently appears to have been abandoned. Doubtless it was intended as a mere insult to the executive, as the Assembly was well aware that his Excellency could as easily have addressed them in Hebrew or in Chinese as in Greek.

The first serious operation of the Parliament was to vote, in April, 1862, an insulting protest against the Protectorate, accusing it of various breaches of the Treaty of Paris, and of local Acts of Parliament, by the manner in which it had wasted on fortifications the revenue of the State. The Lord High Commissioner, by a message of the 10th May, declined to receive the protest as contrary to the constitution. He justly reminded the deputies that the Legislative Assembly existed only by the strength of that constitution, which they now set at defiance by their proceedings. He informed them that petitions, not protests, were the available channels for addressing her Majesty.

The Assembly returned to his Excellency a counter reply, of great length and of unexampled

audacity, referring also to the usual opening address which Sir Henry Storks had previously delivered in person. The document flatly contradicted his assertions of the prosperity of the Islands. It dwelt on their financial difficulties, without condescending to enter into details; preferring, as usual, high-sounding bombast to practical business.* It more justly alluded to the tendency to absolutism on the part of the Lord High Commissioner, and to the concentration of all power in his hands. It denounced his Residents in the subordinate islands. It finished by observing that, "the Protectorate should not have kept its own special interests so much in view," and displayed so much apathy with regard to the Ionians, "*that even at the present day it is ignorant of what takes place in the Seven Islands.*" But it is needless to record any further the proceedings of the twelfth Parliament, which in its spirit and its proceedings resembled so closely its immediate predecessors.

Before the close of 1862 a great change had taken place in the sentiments of the Ionian people. Although the Liberal party had always concentrated its principal hatred upon the local British rulers, a general feeling of bitterness had for some time prevailed against the Government and people of England. But even before the last Greek revolution, the Ionians had commenced to distinguish between

* Parliamentary papers.

Great Britain and its representative. As early as 1859, the idea that Prince Alfred should one day mount the throne of Greece was favorably canvassed by some Ionians. The expulsion of King Otho suddenly converted the hopes of a few into a general desire and expectation on the part of the Greek race in every quarter of the globe. It is a great mistake to imagine that the desire of uniting the Ionian Islands to Greece was the main cause of the enthusiastic desire for an English king. It was rather occasioned by the respect and admiration felt by a feeble but aspiring nation for the most free and most wealthy country in the world, and for its excellent reigning Sovereign. It is well known how little the Greeks generally were consoled for the refusal of Prince Alfred by the promise of the Ionian Islands. In the latter, nearly every one was eager for the Union if Prince Alfred were to be king. But if this could not be, the majority of people of property preferred to remain under the protection of England. The violent demagogues were, also, silenced for a time. Many of them had passed their lives in denouncing England and the Protectorate. Many had been open or secret adherents of King Otho. Some, including the clergy, were known to be in favour of Russia. However, finally, the general desire of the Greek race spread also through the Islands. The demagogues were a little frightened at first at the prospect of the immediate loss of their salaries

as members of Parliament; for the representatives of the Islands at Athens, in case of Union, would probably be greatly diminished in numbers, whilst the salaries would also be reduced. On this account the short-sighted politicians, including the local Government, too readily believed that the Septinsular Parliament would find some excuse at last to vote against the Union. The silence of some of the extreme Liberals gave an air of truth to these suspicions, and in the case of a few base men they may have been well founded. But the author could never imagine that any considerable body of men would so openly sacrifice their honor to their pecuniary interests. On the contrary, in 1862, he repeatedly warned his Protectionist friends that the Union had become inevitable when once the British Government had held out the hope of its possibility. He had also confidently assured them that there was no chance of obtaining an English king for Greece, in spite of the apparent encouragement or hesitation on the part of the London ministerial press. But no honest Briton can find fault with the Protectionists for dreading a union with revolutionary Greece and its disgracefully disorganized army; nor will he suspect them all of acting from base and selfish motives, though some of these will ever mingle in all political parties. The Protectionists had just reasons for fear; for the British Government, by its rash conduct some years

previously, had rendered the most violent democrats masters of the Assembly. The evils of such a condition, restrained for the time by the military force of Great Britain, might very naturally be expected to overwhelm the Islands after the departure of the English.

It is a melancholy but indubitable fact, that if the Ionians should make a bad use of their liberty hereafter, the blame will not rest entirely with themselves. It will be partly due to that great nation which neglected to impart to the Protected the same well-regulated government that rules the Protecting Power itself. In England the vices of monarchy, of aristocracy, and of democracy are restrained, and their virtues are developed by a well-balanced arrangement of those three political elements. Whereas in the Ionian Islands, Great Britain has given the example of an ignorant and intriguing despotism, attempting to govern with the aid of a democracy, in which property and intelligence are very insufficiently represented.

But there is much to be hoped from the present enthusiasm of the Greeks for the English nation. It is usual to imitate whatever we love and admire. Let us hope, then, that, by spontaneous internal reforms, the errors and superstition of a defective civilization may gradually disappear. To perform this useful task there exist many able and intelligent Ionians, if they would but exert their moral courage,

without which nothing good or great can be performed by mortal men. The cession of the Ionian Islands by Great Britain may possibly cause a slight reduction of her physical force; but it will, I believe, greatly extend her moral influence. And surely everything that tends to increase the latter should be a source of satisfaction to a country which so greatly sympathizes with the liberty and happiness of mankind.

It became evident in the spring of 1863 that the union with Greece was a question solely of time. It would therefore have been wisdom in the local English Government to have resigned itself with a good grace to the irresistible logic of events. The Corfiots, grateful to England for her announcement that they might obtain the union with Greece on certain not very difficult conditions, naturally desired publicly to testify their joy. They were, however, debarred from this indulgence by the interference of the individual whose despotic sway was threatened with a speedy termination. The old threadbare expedient of pretended fears of disturbances was employed to prevent the harmless meeting from taking place. The Archbishop of Corfu was to have presided: nor did there exist the slightest probability of a riot. The peaceable Corfiots had never given any trouble even when the representatives of England had repeatedly declared to them that a union with Greece would never be granted. Was it likely

that they would now break out, when their fondest hopes were about to be speedily realized?

It was about this time that the *Morning Post* quoted the despatches of Sir Henry Storks in proof that the union with Greece was still not generally desired in the Islands. The answer to this almost incredible display of ignorance in a ruler whose especial duty it was to know the real opinions of the people is very simple. An Assembly freely elected, which met in October, 1863, for the express purpose of deciding the question, almost unanimously voted for the union with Greece. Only three members could be found to vote for the continuance of the Protectorate. Thus signally were refuted those politicians who had maintained that the radical members would find some excuse for not voting for the Union, and would oppose it when it came as a boon from England. The Assembly not only voted, nearly unanimously for the Union, but accompanied its resolution with expressions of gratitude to the Queen of Great Britain. It is true that silence was preserved as regards her Majesty's Representative; but that could not be a matter of astonishment to any one acquainted with either the spirit or the details of his Excellency's government and policy.*

The thirteenth Parliament, soon after recording

* Vide, in Appendix D, the address of the Assembly, and the conditions prescribed by the Protectorate, in the first instance, for the cession of the Islands.

its vote for the union with Greece, was prorogued for six months, because it would not agree to the conditions laid down by the Protectorate as indispensable to the granting of the Union. The clause that required from the Assembly a guarantee that the Ionian Islands should permanently grant 10,000*l.* a year to the King of the Hellenes, was strongly opposed. This indefensible condition, one in violation of all constitutional government, was afterwards abandoned, thus justifying the opposition on account of which the Assembly had been prorogued. At the same time it would have been wiser to have discussed the conditions, after the vote of the Union, not with the Assembly at Corfu but with the King of the Hellenes at Athens. The former had certainly no further claims on the generosity of the British Government; but with the new King it was far otherwise. They who had persuaded his Majesty to mount a difficult and tottering throne, were bound to support him, and not to impose any conditions likely to render the King unpopular with his new subjects. There was no reason for assigning to his Majesty a special income on the Ionian Islands. When these should have been ceded, united Greece could fix the total revenue of her King in the usual constitutional manner. Great Britain having resolved generously, and entirely of her own free will, to cede the Islands, the more graceful and speedily this could be done the better

for all parties. But this truth does not appear to have been sufficiently appreciated by the British Government.

The conditions enumerated to the Chamber by the Lord High Commissioner made not the slightest allusion to the intended destruction of the fortifications of Corfu. The announcement, therefore, by the English press, that the said destruction must take place previously to the cession of the Islands to the King of the Hellenes, excited equal disgust both at Athens and in the Ionian Islands. Such a step was calculated to weaken the popularity of the throne which had just been set up by the influence and persuasion of the English Ministry.

In the absence of the prorogued Parliament, the clubs of Corfu issued strong protests against what they denounced as an act of oppression and injustice. The bombast, the absurdity, and even ingratitude of these protests (which, in their language ignored the voluntary cession made by England, and spoke of the sovereign authority of the Assembly as the sole arbiter of the fate of the Islands), cannot be denied. Moreover, such proceedings, on account of their hostile tone, and revolutionary form, were calculated rather to confirm than to alter the decision regarding the fortresses. Nevertheless, the interests of the King, crowned, in fact, by the Ministers of England, deserved, and have received every consideration. Thus, the demands of Austria and

Turkey that the ancient fortifications should be razed have only been partially complied with, and the time-honored citadel at least has been preserved from destruction.

Let the Ionians remember that Great Britian has ceded the Islands to Greece, not only without the slightest pressure from other European Powers, but on the contrary, in spite of much reluctance to the measure on the part of several of them. If the people of the ceded Islands become distinguished above other Greeks for their ability and patriotism, such a fact can only be a source of pleasure and of satisfaction to Englishmen. The regeneration of the Greek race in a Christian form may yet become a glorious fact, if the way be first prepared by internal reforms, political, moral, and religious. But these are indispensable both to secure future progress and to obtain the true and permanent friendship and sympathy of Great Britain.

In conclusion, it must be confessed that the proper time has not yet arrived for pronouncing a final decision upon the merits of the tenth and last Lord High Commissioner, in consequence of the very general hostility cherished against him both by the English and the Ionians who lived under his sway. Many of them will think that his errors and failings have been too leniently dealt with in these pages. On the other hand, the friends of Sir Henry Storks will doubtless hold the very contrary opinion.

The author himself has no doubt that Sir Henry commenced his career as Governor with laudable intentions, which, however, were soon frustrated by an inordinate love of despotism, and by an overweening self-esteem. Coldly regardless of the feelings of others, he recklessly raised for himself a host of enemies; and he proved himself to be devoid of the wisdom and foresight, as well as of the conciliatory qualities, necessary in order to govern men successfully. He has also strikingly exemplified the truth of that French verse, which declares that a man may shine in the second rank, and yet be eclipsed in the first.*

* "Tel brille au second rang qui s'eclipse au premier."—*Voltaire.*

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

A.

LIST of some of the works studied by the author on the subject of the Ionian Islands, in addition to the information derived from local and personal sources.

1. Finlay's *History of Greece.*
2. Freiherr Wilhelm von Reden. *Die Türkei und Griechenland.*
3. Dr. Wolff's *Travels.*
4. Bayard Taylor's (the American) *Travels in Greece and Russia.*
5. Sir Charles Napier's *Colonies.*
6. Sir George Bowen's *The Ionian Islands under British Protection.* 1850.
7. An Ionian's *Answer to Bowen.* 1851.
8. *Delle Cose Corciresi,* by A. Mustoxidi.
9. Baron Theotoky's *Détails sur Corfou.*
10. Jervis's *History of Corfu.* 1851.
11. *La Statistica Generale del' Isola di Cefalonia, &c.,* da Dr. Marino Salomon. 1859.
12. *Confufazioni,* di A. Mustoxidi. 1841.
13. *Delle Isole Ionie sotto il Reggimento dei Republicani Francesi,* del Conte Ermanno Lunzi. 1862.

14. *La Question Ionienne devant l'Europe*, par François Lenormant. 1859.

15. *Le Gouvernement des Iles Ioniennes. Lettre à Lord John Russell*, par François Lenormant. 1861.

16. *Memoirs* of General Vaudoncourt. 1816.

17. Dr. Davy's *Ionian Islands*. 1842.

18. Τα Μυστήρια τῆς Κεφαλονίας, by Andrew Lascaratos. 1856.

19. *Costituzione degli Stati uniti delle Isole Ionie*. 1817.

20. Daru's *Histoire de Venise*.

21. *Le Spectateur de l'Orient*.

22. Stanley's *Eastern Church*.

23. Colonel Leake's *Travels in Northern Greece*.

24. Parliamentary Papers, 1858-59, 1861-2-3.

25. *Extraits des Observations addressées à S. S. le Lord Castlereagh à Vienne, le 9 Avril*, 1815, par le Comte J. Capodistrias.

26. *The History of the Ionian Islands under the Venetians*, in Italian (and translated also in modern Greek), by Count Ermanno Lunzi. 1862.

27. *Della Repubblica Settinsulare*, by the same author. 1863.

28. *Diary in the Turkish and Greek Waters*, by the Earl of Carlisle.

29. Hazlitt's *History of the Republic of Venice*.

30. *The Ionian Islands*, by John Dunn Gardner, Esq. 1859.

31. Jervis's *Ionian Islands*. 1863.

32. *Le Mie Sofferenze*, da A. Lascarto. 1860.

33. Count Dusmani's *Observations, &c.* 1863.

34. Sir George Marcoran's pamphlet. 1863.

35. Sir Anastasius Xydias' pamphlet. 1863.

36. *La Grèce depuis la Révolution*. François Lenormant. (*Revue des Deux Mondes* of January, 1864.)

B.

Convention entre les Cours de Vienne, de Saint-Pétersbourg, de Londres et de Berlin, pour fixer le sort des sept îles Ioniennes, signée à Paris, le 5 novembre 1815.

Au nom de la très-sainte et indivisible Trinité,

Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, Sa Majesté le Roi du royaume-uni de la Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande, Sa Majesté l'Empereur de toutes les Russies, et Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, animés du désir de donner suite aux négociations ajournées lors du Congrès de Vienne, afin de fixer le sort des sept îles Ioniennes, et d'assurer l'indépendance, la liberté et le bonheur des habitants de ces îles, en les plaçant, eux et leur constitution, sous la protection immédiate d'une des grandes Puissances de l'Europe, sont convenus de régler définitivement tout ce qui a rapport à cet objet par un acte spécial, lequel étant fondé sur les droits résultant du Traité de Paris, du 30 mai 1814, ainsi que sur les déclarations britanniques à l'époque où les armes de l'Angleterre ont délivré Cerigo, Zante, Céphalonie, Sainte-Maure, Ithaque et Paxo, sera envisagé comme faisant partie du Traité général signé à Vienne, le 9 juin 1815, à la suite du Congrès; et pour arrêter et signer ledit acte, les hautes parties contractantes ont nommé plénipotentiaires, savoir:

Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême; le sieur Clément Venceslas Lothaire, prince de Metternich-Winnebourg-Ochsenhausen, chevalier de la Toison-d'Or, grand-croix de l'ordre royal de Saint-Etienne, chevalier des ordres de Saint-André, de Saint-Alexandre-Newsky et de Sainte-Anne de la première classe, grand-cordon de la Légion d'honneur, chevalier de l'ordre de

l'Éléphant, de l'ordre suprême de l'Annonciade, de l'Aigle noire et de l'Aigle rouge, des Séraphins, de Saint-Joseph de Toscane, de Saint-Hubert, de l'Aigle d'or de Wurtemberg, de la Fidélité de Bade, de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem et de plusieurs autres, chancelier de l'ordre militaire de Marie-Thérèse, curateur de l'académie des beaux-arts, chambellan, conseiller intime actuel de Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, son ministre d'État, des conférences et des affaires étrangères;—et le sieur Jean Philippe, baron de Wessenberg, grand-croix de l'ordre royal de Saint-Etienne, chevalier grand-croix de l'ordre militaire et religieux des Saints Maurice et Lazare, grand-croix de l'ordre de l'Aigle rouge de Prusse et de celui de la couronne de Bavière, de Saint-Joseph de Toscane et de la Fidélité de Bade, chambellan et conseiller intime actuel de Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême;

Et Sa Majesté le Roi du Royaume-Uni de la Grande-Bretagne de l'Irlande les très-honorables Robert Stewart, vicomte Castlereagh, chevalier de l'ordre très-noble de la Jarretière, conseiller de Sadite Majesté et son conseil privé, membre du parlement, colonel du régiment de Milice de Londonderry et son principal secrétaire d'État ayant le département des affaires étrangères,—et le très-illustre et très-noble seigneur Arthur, duc, marquis et comte Wellington de Talavera et de Wellington, et baron Douro de Wellesley, conseiller de Sa dite Majesté et son conseil privé, Feld-Maréchal de ses armées, colonel du régiment royal des gardes à cheval, chevalier du très-noble ordre de la Jarretière, chevalier grand-croix du très-noble ordre du Bain, prince de Waterloo, duc de Ciudad-Rodrigo et grand d'Espagne de première classe, duc de Vittoria, marquis de Torres-Vedras, comte de Vimeira en Portugal, chevalier de

l'ordre très-illustre de la Toison-d'Or, de l'ordre militaire d'Espagne de Saint-Ferdinand, chevalier grand-croix de l'ordre impérial militaire de Marie-Thérèse, chevalier grand-croix de l'ordre imperial de Saint-Georges de Russie, chevalier grand-croix de l'ordre de l'Aigle-Noir de Prusse, chevalier grand-croix de l'ordre royal militaire de Portugal de la Tour et de l'Épée, chevalier grand-croix de l'ordre royal militaire de Suède de l'Épée, chevalier grand-croix des ordres de l'Éléphant de Danemark, de Guillaume des Pays-Bas, de l'Annonciade de Sardaigne, de Maximilien Joseph de Bavière, et de plusieurs autres, commandant en chef les armées britanniques en France et celles de Sa Majesté le Roi des Pays-Bas.

Lesquels, après avoir échangé leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des articles suivants:

ARTICLE Ier.

Les îles de Corfou, Céphalonie, Zante, Sainte-Maure, Ithaque, Cerigo et Paxo, avec leurs dépendances, telles qu'elles sont désignées dans le Traité entre Sa Majesté l'Empereur de toutes les Russies et la Porte-Ottomane du 21 mars 1800, formeront un seul État libre et indépendant, sous la dénomination d'États-Unis des Iles Ioniennes.

ART. II.

Cet État sera placé sous la protection immédiate et exclusive de Sa Majesté le Roi du Royaume-Uni de la Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande, et de ses héritiers et successeurs. En conséquence, les autres Puissances contractantes renoncent à tout droit et prétention particulière qu'elle auraient pu former à cet égard, et garantissent formellement toutes les dispositions du présent Traité.

ART. III.

Les États-Unis des Iles Ioniennes régleront, avec l'approbation de la puissance protectrice, leur organisation intérieure: et pour donner à toutes les parties de cette organisation la consistance et l'action nécessaire, Sa Majesté Britannique vouera une sollicitude particulière à la législation et à l'administration générale de ces États. En conséquence Sa Majesté nommera pour y résider un Lord Commissaire Supérieur qui sera investi de toute l'autorité nécessaire à cet effet.

ART. IV.

Afin de mettre en exécution sans délai les stipulations consignées dans les articles précédents, et fonder la réorganisation politique des États-Unis Ioniens sur cette organisation qui est actuellement en vigueur, le Lord Commissaire Supérieur de la Puissance protectrice réglera les formes de convocation d'une assemblée législative, dont il dirigera les opérations, à l'effet de rédiger pour cet État une nouvelle charte constitutionnelle que Sa Majesté Britannique sera priée de ratifier. Jusqu'au moment où une pareille charte constitutionnelle sera rédigée et dûment ratifiée, les constitutions existantes resteront en vigueur dans les différentes îles, et aucun changement ne pourra y être fait que par Sa Majesté Britannique dans son Conseil.

ART. V.

Pour assurer sans restriction aux habitants des États-Unis des Iles Ioniennes les avantages résultant de la haute protection sous laquelle ils sont placés, ainsi que pour l'exercice des droits inhérents à cette protection, Sa Majesté Britannique aura celui d'occuper les forteresses et places de ces États et d'y tenir garnison. La force militaire desdits

États-Unis sera de même sous les ordres du commandant des troupes de Sa Majesté Britannique.

ART. VI.

Sa Majesté Britannique consent à ce qu'une convention particulière avec le gouvernement desdits États-Unis règle d'après les revenus de l'État tous les objets relatifs au maintien des forteresses actuellement existantes, ainsi qu'à l'entretien et au payement des garnisons britanniques et au nombre d'hommes qui les composent en temps de paix. La même convention fixera en outre les rapports qui devront avoir lieu entre cette force armée et le gouvernement ionien.

ART. VII.

Le pavillon marchand des États-Unis des Iles Ioniennes sera reconnu par toutes les parties contractantes comme pavillon d'un État libre et indépendant. Il portera, avec les couleurs et au-dessus des armoiries qu'il a déployées avant 1807, celles que Sa Majesté Britannique pourra juger à propos de lui accorder en signe de la protection sous laquelle lesdits États-Unis Ioniens sont placés ; et, pour donner plus de poids encore à cette protection, tous les ports desdits États sont déclarés être, quant aux droits honorifiques et militaires, sous la juridiction britannique.

Le commerce entre les États-Unis Ioniens et les États de Sa Majesté Impériale et Royale Apostolique, jouira des mêmes avantages et facilités que celui de la Grande-Bretagne avec lesdits États-Unis.

Il ne sera accrédité aux États-Unis des Iles Ioniennes que des agents commerciaux ou consuls chargés uniquement de la gestion des relations commerciales, et assujettis aux

règlements auxquels les agents commerciaux ou consuls sont soumis dans les autres États indépendants.

ART. VIII.

Toutes les Puissances qui ont signé le Traité de Paris du 30 mai 1814 et l'Acte du Congrès de Vienne du 9 juin 1815, et, en outre, Sa Majesté le Roi des Deux-Siciles et la Porte-Ottomane, seront invités à accéder à la présente convention.

ART. IX.

Le présent acte sera ratifié, et les deux ratifications seront échangées dans deux mois, ou plus tôt, si faire se peut.

En foi de quoi les plénipotentiaires respectifs l'ont signé et y ont apposé le cachet de leurs armes.

Fait à Paris le cinq novembre mil-huit-cent-quinze.

(L. S.) *Le prince de* METTERNICH.
(L. S.) *Le baron de* WESSEMBERG.
(L. S.) CASTLEREAGH.
(L. S.) WELLINGTON.
(L. S.) *Le Conte* CAPODISTRIAS.
(L. S.) *Le Prince de* RASOUMOUFFSKY.*

* The author is not able to give all the signatures to the treaty, but the above are sufficient for historical purposes.

C.

Revenue and Expenditure in the Ionian Islands during the under-mentioned years:

		Revenue. £	Expenditure. £
Sir Robert Campbell	1815	68,459	48,500
Sir Thomas Maitland	1817	103,997	87,420*
Sir Frederick Adam, *average from*	1825 to 1832	140,000	156,000
Sir Howard Douglas	1838	203,240	250,195
Mr. Mackenzie	1843	135,031	127,403
Lord Seaton	1847	143,829	144,578
Sir Henry Ward	1850	146,837	153,544
	1852	102,587	139,676
Sir John Young	1855	127,471	140,244
Sir Henry Storks	1860	140,855	151,187
In 1860 Sir Henry Storks reported the average revenue and expenditure for *the previous twenty years*		172,000	182,000

Showing an annual deficit of 10,000*l.* a year.

The Septinsular Debt.

	Surplus. £	Debt. £
Sir R. Campbell	20,000†	—
Sir T. Maitland	130,000	—
Sir F. Adam	nil.	nil.‡

* Of this 87,000*l.* the salaries of sixty-two English officials amounted to 16,397*l.* 17*s.* Yet, though numbers of the English, and also the amount of their salaries, were afterwards reduced, all the successors of Sir Thomas Maitland greatly exceeded him in expenditure.

N.B. The years which have been given above, have been selected so as to furnish a fair estimate of the comparative economy of the several Lord High Commissioners.

† This was the surplus in 1815, it appears, according to Papanicolas. But it must have been spent before the arrival of Sir Thomas Maitland, who found only a few coppers in the treasury.

‡ Sir F. Adam spent (with a far greater income than his predecessor) all the surplus left by the latter.

	Surplus. £	Debt. £
Lord Nugent	126,550	—
Sir H. Douglas	—	150,450
Mr. Mackenzie	—	131,000
Lord Seaton	—	216,000*
Sir Henry Ward . (unknown with any certainty to the author)		
Sir Henry Storks (in 1860)	—	298,726 †

D.

Corfu Gazette, October 3, 1863:

"The following is the speech of his Excellency the Lord High Commissioner of the United States of the Ionian Islands to the Legislative Assembly of the said States:

"'MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,

"'You have already learnt from my proclamation the reasons which induced the Protecting Sovereign to dissolve the late Ionian Parliament. Her Majesty the Queen, ever desirous of testifying her friendship and good will towards the Greek nation, has, with a view to increase the territory and to consolidate the strength of the Greek Kingdom, intimated to the Powers of Europe her readiness to relinquish the Protectorate hitherto held by her over these States in virtue of the treaty of 1815. Mindful of her solemn obligations, the Queen has been desirous of ascertaining from the Ionian people their wishes in regard to their national future. Her Majesty, therefore, under the powers reserved by the constitution, has convened a new Parliament as the

* This is the amount of debt given by Lord Seaton's friend, Papanicolas.

† Of this, 90,000*l.* due to the Protectorate has been remitted, and further steps have been taken for the reduction of the debt.

legal and authentic method of ascertaining these wishes. By means of the provisions stipulated by the constitution, a full cognizance of the condition of public affairs has been acquired by the Ionian people, and free and unbiased elections have given them the opportunity of deliberately forming and expressing their opinion on a question so intimately connected with the national interests. They have availed themselves of this opportunity by electing the present Assembly, and I now call upon you, Gentlemen, to inform me in the usual address, with a delay as short as you may consider proper, whether it is or is not the desire of the people, by whom you have been chosen, and whose representatives you are, that the Protectorate of her Majesty the Queen, my august Sovereign, over these States should cease, with the intent that the Ionian Islands should form henceforth a portion of the kingdom of Greece under his Majesty King George and his successors.

"'In case your answer should be in favour of annexation to Greece, it will be my duty to lay before you, by message, certain detailed arrangements which are requisite for the completion of this measure:

"'1. It will be necessary that you should pass a resolution in the usual constitutional form, by which, after the cessation of the British Protectorate, and until the establishment of the new constitution, his Majesty the King of the Hellenes shall be enabled to exercise in these States his rights of sovereignty, including those privileges and functions heretofore exercised by the protecting Sovereign, the Lord High Commissioner, and the most illustrious the Senate.

"'2. I shall propose to you, in the name of her Majesty, that, on the cessation of the payment of the sums heretofore reserved as the contribution for military protection, and as the Civil List of the Lord High Commissioner, there shall

be reserved, as the first charge on the Ionian revenue, the sum of 10,000*l.* yearly in augmentation of the Civil List of his Majesty King George.*

"'3. I shall call upon you to recognize all contracts and engagements entered into by or on behalf of the Ionian Government up to this time, and all equitable claims on the same.

"'4. I shall also invite you to make provision for the preservation and safeguard of the British cemeteries in this and the other islands.

"'5. I shall have to inform you of the terms on which her Majesty's Government is prepared to come to a settlement of the debt of 90,289*l.* 5s. 7d. due to Great Britain for arrears of military contribution.†

"'Should your vote be in favour of the cessation of the Protectorate, and of the proposed union with Greece, it will be necessary that her Majesty the Queen should invite the Powers parties to the treaty of November, 1815, to revise that treaty, and, in conjunction with France, one of the Protecting Powers of Greece, to make such arrangements as may tend to the future welfare of these States and the permanent interests of Europe.‡

"'I now leave you to your deliberations, and in so doing will merely echo the wish expressed by her Majesty, that you may be guided to a wise decision, and that the national happiness and prosperity of the Ionian people may, by your suffrages, be secured on a solid foundation.

"'By command of his Excellency,

"'H. DRUMMOND WOLFF,

"'Secretary to the Lord High Commissioner.'"

* This clause, as a compulsory measure, was objected to by the Assembly.

† This debt was remitted by the British Government.

‡ This was the only clause that might be interpreted as alluding to the destruction of the fortifications. "But surely the intention should have been more boldly and frankly expressed.

"Corfu, October 5, 1852. — The Ionian Assembly has voted successively the following Decree and Address:

"DECREE.

"The Ionian Assembly, elected on the invitation of the protecting Powers, and convoked in view of pronouncing on the subject of the restoration of the Ionian people, manifesting faithfully their ardent desire and constant will, and conforming itself to the declarations and votes passed on several preceding occasions by the free Ionian Assemblies,

"Decrees,—That the islands of Corfu, Cephalonia, Zante, St. Maura, Ithaca, Cerigo, and Paxo, as well as their dependencies, shall be united to the kingdom of Greece, so as to form an integral part of it in perpetuity, forming a single indivisible State, under the constitutional sceptre of his Majesty the King of the Hellenes, George I., and his successors.

"Done in the Hall of the Assembly, September 23, year of grace 1863."

"ADDRESS OF THE IONIAN ASSEMBLY IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF THE LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

"EXCELLENCY,—The Ionian people, invited by her Majesty the Queen Protectress to pronounce formally on the subject of their national restoration, have elected the representatives to whom they have confided the accomplishment of their will. In execution of that sacred mission, the Assembly, after having heard the speech of your Excellency, has believed it to be its indispensable duty to proceed to the issuing of a decree consecrating the firm decision of the Ionian representation. By this decree your most gra-

cious Sovereign, and the other great protecting Powers of Greece, will be fully convinced that the Ionian people, having always sought its national restoration, sanctions to-day the decisions and the conduct of its preceding free Assemblies, pronouncing for the cessation of the protectorate and for the entire and complete re-union of the Ionian Islands with the kingdom of Greece under the constitutional sceptre of his Majesty the King of the Hellenes, George I., and his successors. The Assembly reserves to itself to declare its decision upon the propositions mentioned in the speech of your Excellency, as soon as the Chambers shall have received the communication which is to be presented to them. The Assembly is convinced that the arrangements referred to in the speech of your Excellency, and which will be taken by the European Powers, will fully answer the just and ardent hopes which have been conceived by the Ionian people since their recent convention concerning Greece and the Seven Islands.

"Excellency,—In the midst of the unspeakable joy which fills all hearts, the Assembly ought to express the gratitude of the Ionian people to the august Sovereign of Great Britain for the decision which she has deigned to take, and for the benevolent disposition of her Majesty towards the Greek nation. The Assembly ought equally to express the same sentiments in regard to the other protecting Powers of Greece, for their concurrence in the realization of the wishes of the Ionians for national restoration, and for their good will to the Greeks in general. Christian Europe, appreciating the services which Greece has rendered to humanity, will doubtless wish to lend its assistance to the Greek nation for its complete restoration, in the interest of civilization, and for the accomplishment of the decrees of the Most High."

In receiving the preceding Address, the Lord High Commissioner replied to the Assembly as follows:

"MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,—

"I will hasten to communicate to the Secretary of State of her Majesty, to be submitted to the Sovereign Protectress, the desire which the Ionian people express in your address to see the cessation of the protectorate exercised over the State by her Majesty, my august Sovereign, in order that the Ionian Islands may form in future part of the kingdom of Greece, under the sceptre of his Majesty King George and his successors. I will communicate without delay to the Legislative Assembly, in the accustomed form, the detailed arrangements which are necessary to complete this measure, and I take pleasure in believing that in the interest of the country, you will proceed to a prompt resolution upon the points which will be submitted to your deliberations. I hope sincerely that the vote which you have just pronounced will not fail to assure the welfare and the prosperity of the Ionian people."

Te Deums and thanks for the Union obtained, acclamations to his Majesty the King of the Hellenes, solemn demonstrations in favour of the Queen of Great Britain and the protecting Powers of Greece, sumptuous illuminations—nothing has been omitted during these last days to render as brilliant as possible the manifestations of the public joy.

END OF VOL. I.

00060494

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 June, 2018